3936. b

THE STATE OF THE NOW-ROMANE CHVRCH.

Discussed

By way of vindication of the Right Reuerend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of EXCETER,

From the weake cauills of HENRY BVRTON.

By H. C. Cholmley

K. Cholmley (H.)

LONDON,
Printed for *Philemon Stephens.*
1629.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO
THE RIGHT RE-
uerend Father in GOD,
IOSEPH, by the providence
of God Lord Bishop of *Exeter*,
Grace, mercy, and peace, be
multiplied.

Right Reuerend and Honourable,

MY very good Lord,
It was well said of
old, *Let Baal plead* Iudg. 6. 31.
for himselfe: And it
may be said as wel
now, Let Babel plead for her self:
yea let him be blessed that dasheth Psalme 137. 9.
her little ones against the stones.

And let it be done to her, as shee hath done to others; And let all the people of God say Amen.

Reuel. 18. 6.

Neuertheleſſe, herein (if in any thing in the world) great arte and skill is to be vſed: For it is not for euery freſh water ſouldier to fight againſt Babel. The Poet ſaith,

In vitium ducit culpæ fuga ſi caret arte.

The want of skill to ſhun a ſhame,
Doth bring a man to mickle blame.

And it is a true saying that God loues Aduerbs better then Adiectiues, ſo as if a man doe good things, and doe them not well, hee is an offender notwithſtanding; ſo is it in this caſe: he that will make warre againſt Babel, and will not do more hurt then good, had need to bee well prouided, and aduiſed. *Plutarch* makes re-

port of one, who vnaduiſedly caſting a ſtone at a dogge, hit and hurt his owne mother; and ſo many there are, who ignorantly and inconſiderately contending againſt Babel, doe grieuouſly wound the Church of God, and (as your Lordſhip ſaith truly) do more wrong to their cauſe, then to their aduerſaries: If any man be ignorant how this may be, and bee willing to learne, you haue well informed him in your laſt Book of the Old Religion; wherein you make it plaine, that though Rome bee Babel, yet ſo long as ſhe is Babel, ſhe ſhall haue a people of God in her: ſo that as Saint *Paul* ſaid, *They are not all Iſrael that are of Iſrael*; ſo may wee in this caſe, They are not all Babel, that

Reuel. 18. 4.

Rom. 9. 6.

are in Babel, and communicate with Babel. If then a man haue not a ſpirituall eye, to diſtinguiſh betweene Babel, and the people of God in Babel; how much miſchiefe may hee doe in quarelling with Babel? I would wee had not too much experience hereof in ſome, who make good your Lordſhips too juſt cenſure, that *Zeale* tranſports them to ſuch a deteſtation of the *Romane Church*, as if it were all error, no Church, and ſo that no ſoule can be ſaued therein: A fearfull and heauie doome, of which a man may ſay, as Saint *Bernard* ſaid in another caſe, *Solo auditu contremiſco*: I tremble at the very hearing of it.

Now your Lordſhip (as a good Souldier of Ieſus Chriſt, and one

of the Colonels of the ſpirituall Armie of the Lord of hoaſts) endeuouring amongſt other errors to reforme this, and to bring all into right and perfect order; that is, to traine all the ſouldiers vnder your regiment according to the old diſcipline; which is, to entend to cure Babel, and not to deſtroy her before the time, (that it may truly be ſaid of them, as well as of others, We would haue cured Babel, but ſhe would not be cured, the time of curing being not paſt, ſo long as it is called to day.) Ier. 51. 45. Heb. 3. 13. There are riſen vp, I know not what hot-ſpurres, and bold Braggadochioes in the Campe, who mutinouſlie doe turne their weapons from Babel againſt you; as if you were therefore become

Gal. 4 16. their enemy, because you tell them the truth. And amongst others, one Master *Henry Burton*, hath publikely taken the quarrell vpon himselfe in the name of all the rest; who being otherwise a man of good parts (as it should seem) and hauing a good meaning to doe Gods Church some seruice, yet ouerweening himselfe, and forgetting his place, hath giuen the common aduersary too much aduantage against vs all. For being defectiue in Logick (our best engine, after the word of God) and trusting to nothing but meer sophistry, and failing in the truth, or true meaning of all his allegations; he hath not onely shamed himselfe, but put vs all out of order, hindred our good proceedings,

dings, weakned our owne forces by diuiſion, and ſtrengthned the enemy.

Whereupon (it being not any way conuenient that your Lordſhip ſhould enter into the liſts with him;) vpon an incident occaſion of ſpeech about this matter in the beginning of September, it pleaſed you to accept an offer of my ſeruice in this buſineſſe; although vpon heare-ſay onely at that time, and not otherwiſe, I had notice of his misbehauiour.

Here therefore, I tender vnto your Lordſhip ſome teſtimony, not ſo much of the old innocent familiarity, which almoſt from the cradle hath beene betweene vs, as of my readineſs to performe all parts of that Canonicall obedi-

ence,

ence, which being due to all my Dioceſans; I am moſt joyfull to yeeld vnto you aboue, and before all the men in the world.

Accept then (I beſeech you) and protect, this vnworthy ſeuē daies defence of your worthy cauſe; protect it (I ſay) thogh not as your owne (being vnworthy) yet for your owne, in reſpect of the worthie cauſe which is your owne: And ſo I ſhall be encouraged to performe all offices not onely to my ancienteſt, neareſt, deareſt, and greateſt friend; but alſo to my Biſhop, Lord, and Gouernour: and euer reſt,

6 JY 59.

Your Lordſhips Chaplaine in all humility to be commanded,

Hugh Cholmeley.

To M. Henry Burton

Rector of S^t. *Mathewes* in Friday-street in London; *H. C.* Rector of *the portion of Clare in the Parish* of Tyuerton in Devon, *sendeth greeting.*

Master Burton, *as you are a man altogether vnknowne to me, but onely by your writings, so I am not desirous to bee your aduersary in any the least point of truth; I loue you in the truth, and I oppose you in loue of the truth; And if you can soundly and substantially conuince me of vntruth; I professe before God and the world, that I will yeeld vnto you without any more adoe: being already willing to bee ouercome of the truth in this cause: You need not disclaime the match; I suppose my selfe your*

equall

equall for time, ſtudies, or labour; and if your deſire be ſincere, onely to finde out the truth; Loe, I am as you are: Paſſe by our Reuerend Dioceſan; and let me beare the brunt of this skirmiſh: Your victory ſhall be great enough; and your foile farre more eaſie and tolerable.

Your loving friend, and
fellow Labourer in
the work of the
LORD,

H. C.

THE STATE OF the Now-Romane CHVRCH.

THere can be no more euident signe of a bad cause, then if it be handled falsly and sophistically: for (as *Euripides* saith)

Ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ
Ὁ δ' ἄδικος λόγος,
Νοσῶν ἐν αὐτῷ φαρμακῶν δεῖται σοφῶν.

The truth is sound, her words are plaine,
Falshood is sicke; she needs must faine.

Which being so, we may soone perceiue what we are to thinke of Mr. *Burtons* cause; who hauing taken vpon himselfe to oppose men euery way better then

then himſelfe, about the truth, and true viſibilitie of the Church of *Rome*; vſeth all kind of ſophiſtrie and deceit: as may appeare both by the whole Diſcourſe, and by euery part and parcell thereof.

In the whole you ſhall perceiue two points of notable ſophiſtrie common to him with all thoſe that maintaine bad cauſes. One is Beggery, commonly called of the Logitians, *Petitio principij*, which proueth one obſcure or vncertaine thing by another; or would haue that to be granted which reaſon denyeth: Another is Diſorder, which is *Horaces Humano capiti, &c.* and *Onids Rudis indigeſtaq; moles.* A confuſed heape of independencies, like a Lotterers pitcher, full of ſcrowles ſhuffled together, without any reference one to another.

His Beggery will ſoone appeare, if we reſolue this diſpute into that *Enthymeme*, whereof it wholly conſiſteth; which is this: *S. Iohn* ſaith, *The ſecond Angell powred out his viall vpon the Sea, and it became as the blood of a dead man, and euery liuing ſoule dyed in the ſea:*

Ergo,

Ergo, the Church of *Rome* is neyther a true Church, nor a true visible Church. To which I may say farre better then *Fisher* said to *Perkins*: *Apply Iohn Barber, and thou shalt haue a new paire of Sizars.* Whether I wrong him or no, I referre my selfe to the censure of euery iudicious Reader: And if I wrong him not, euery man may see, that hee beggeth two things which no good Diuine may yeeld vnto him: One is, that an Allegoricall Prophecie (such as this is) may bee laid for a good foundation, whereon to frame an Argument to decide a Controuersie in Diuinitie, contrary to the old Maxime, *Theologia symbolica non est argumentatiua*: Allegories in diuinitie afford no good arguments. Especially if they be Prophecies, whereof there may be doubt whether they be fulfilled or no: in which case the tryall is, to examine the perspicuitie thereof: for a Prophecie, as of all Scriptures it is most obscure, before it be fulfilled, so when it is fulfilled it is of all other most cleare, and easie: This therefore being an Allegory, and

Pro-

prophetically, and retaining the ænigmaticall darkenesse which it had originally (as appeareth by the various interpretations of the Learned, euery day renewed) I for my part cannot suppose it to be yet accomplished; and so (to me) it is vnfit for that vse to which hee hath imployed it.

The other point of his Beggerie is, That his owne priuate interpretation of these words may be allowed as the true meaning of the holy Ghost: which is, That by the Sea we are to vnderstand the Doctrines of the Counsel of *Trent*: by the blood, the abominable corruptions therof: by the Angel, *Chemnitius*, and other learned men of that time that examined it: and by the pouring out of the viall, their preachings and writings. All which hee hath borrowed from *Brightman*, whom notwithstanding elsewhere he forsaketh. But now what if we deny him this interpretation, and require some proofe hereof, what will he say then? Surely hee is vtterly disappointed, and all his building falls to the ground. If he say, we must show some

reason

reason for our denyall; besides that we haue shewed some already, it would be knowne, why we may not as well deny, as he affirme without reason: If this course bee good, euery mans priuate fantasie (especially if he can make some shew of probability) must bee [illegible] the Reuelations Reuelation: And then why may not *Bellarmines* interpretation of the ninth cap. (*Oratione in Scholis habita*) wherein he turnes all vpon *Luther* and the Lutherans) passe for current? But lest I may seeme to seeke euasions; I will doe that against him, which he cannot, or at least hath not yet done for himselfe: I will shew some reason for my denyall; and leaue it to the iudgement of the Learned: And because the ground of all is that the Councell of Trent, or the doctrines thereof, are that bloody sea: I suppose it sufficient (if I proue it to bee otherwise) to turne vp all his phantasticall Cauillation.

First therefore I proue it *ex præconcessis*; for hee granteth, that the same Sea whereof cap. 3. 8. the third part

was turned into blood, is here wholly turned thereinto. Now *Brightman*, (whom in this point he followeth) will haue that third part of the Sea, to bee the doctrine of Europe, the third part of the Christian world: And then καὶ πᾶσα ψυχὴ: the whole sea is the doctrine of the whole Christian world: But the doctrine of the Councell of Trent, is not the doctrine of the whole Christian world: *Ergo* it is not the Sea here mentioned by S. *Iohn*.

Secondly, vpon the powring out of this second Viall; this sea is turned into congealed and putrified blood, which (by his interpretation) signifieth that by the conclusions of the Councell of Trent, Romes doctrines are become mortall and damnable: and this puts a difference betweene the state of Romes doctrines before the Councel of Trent (while as yet they were in their growing) and after it: Before there was some fresh water, &c. but after none at all. So saith he: But I say that the Councell of Trent hath not a whit corrupted Romes Doctrines more than they were

a long

a long time before: *Ergo* the Councell of Trents conclusions are not here to be vnderstood. I need not take paines in the proofe hereof; because the learned doe not accuse it of this fault; but that (whereas it promised reformation, and that it was expected ther-from) it colened the world; and in stead of reforming confirmed the foule corruptions of the religion and doctrine of the Church which formerly had preuailed: Indeed Master *Grashaw* (whose memory for old acquaintance is pretious to me) noteth one, (and but one) point of doctrine (for the other is only for practice) wherein the Councell of Trent hath added some thing to the former corruptions, which is, the equalizing of the Apocrypha with the Canonicall books of Scripture: But if we consider how he interpreteth himselfe (that no Councell before had done the like) it will appeare, that hee denyeth not, but that euen that corruption also was inueterate before the Councell of Trent.

Thirdly, I say that the Councell of

Trent hath reformed Romes doctrine, and made it (at leaſt in one point) better then it was before: *Ergo* it is not here to be vnderſtood. The point is this, that there is no naturall ability in a man, to prepare himſelfe for grace, and ſo no merit of congruity, in which regard *Stapleton* ſaith, *Meritum ex congruo exploſum eſt*: a point of no ſmall moment in theſe dayes.

Fourthly, I ſay that there is as much freſh water in Romes doctrines ſince the Councell of Trent, as there was before: *Ergo* it is not here to bee vnderſtood. This I proue, by the doctrine of the Tridentine Catechiſme, in euery part whereof there is ſufficient quantity of ſauing doctrine for thoſe that (to vſe your owne words) can ſearch and find it out; ſeparating the good from the bad, and truth from errour: as may appeare to them that will take the paines to reade it: yea I dare bee bold to ſay, the Church of Rome had not for many hundred yeares before the Councell of Trent, ſo good a forme of doctrine, as that Catechiſme contai-

neth:

neth: which I ſpeake not to juſtifie the Councell, or the Catechiſme, in any errour comprehended therein; but only to ſhew the beggery of the aduerſarie: of which this ſhall be ſufficient.

His diſorder ſhewes it ſelfe in three things; Firſt, in not ſetting the ſtate of the queſtion: Secondly, in miſplacing his owne arguments: Thirdly, in idle repetitions. For the firſt: There cannot be a greater fault in a Diſputant, then either to leave the queſtion altogether vnſtated; or elſe to ſtate it amiſſe; for by this meanes it ordinarily fals out, that the contention is nothing elſe but *Andabatarum pugna*, the fight at blind man buffe (as we ſay,) ſo as a man may miſſe ten times, before hee hit once: But of the two the former is the worſe, wherein this our aduerſary offendeth: If he ſay, he tooke it as hee found it; it will not excuſe: For I dare ſay his pretended aduerſaries intended not a combat; if they had, they would haue depriued him of the occaſion of much babbling: And yet, had he not liſted to be contentious, hee might haue picked

such a state of the question out of the defenders writings, as might haue dulled the edge of his quarrelsome humor: for the state being set aright, and with perspicuity, it will easily appeare to which side the truth inclineth: wherefore that I offend not in that wherein I finde him to be faulty; I will doe that which he hath left vnperformed. First then wee are to know, that the words whereof the question consisteth are full of ambiguity: For both the Church of Rome, and a true Church, and a Church truly visible, haue many senses, and significations: The Church of Rome hath at least eight seuerall acceptions: For sometimes it noteth the particular Dioceſſe of the Romane territory, commonly called the particular Romane Church: Sometimes (and most vsually) it comprehendeth all the national Churches which communicate with Rome in the same faith, and vnder the same head, the Pope; commonly called the Catholique Romane Church: Sometimes the Clergy of that Church is onely vnderstood by

that title, commonly called the Church repreſentatiue: Sometimes the people onely, commonly called the Laity, and of ſome the popular Church of Rome: Sometimes the whole body of Clergy and Laity: Sometimes the Papacy, or Apoſtacy in that Church, which is S. *Iohns* Babylon: Sometimes the Elect in that Church, ſtill communicating with the Papacy, which S. *Iohn* calls Gods people: And ſometimes the hidden Church which is in the Romane Church, and yet communicateth not with her abominations; which ſome call the Church in the wilderneſſe. Againe, A Church is ſaid to bee true, diuers wayes: As firſt materially, in that it conſiſteth of a people comprehended within the compaſſe of Gods Couenant of life, and ſaluation: Secondly, formally, in regard of frame, and conſtitution: Thirdly, accidentally, in regard of ſoundnes, and outward communion. Thirdly, a Church is ſaid to be truly viſible for the true markes of a Church which it hath; either in regard of it ſelfe within it ſelfe; in which

reſpect, the Churches in perſecution are truly viſible, though their enemies and others which are not of their number ſee them not: Or in regard of the world abroad: whether Chriſtians or Infidels which know her aſſemblies: And in this latter ſenſe againe, it is ſaid to be viſible, either ſtrictly and properly, when the whole Church is viſible at once, and all together (which is onely true of particular Congregations) or largely and Synechdochically, when the whole cannot bee viſible together, and at once, but by peecemeale, and ſucceſſion: and ſo the Catholique Church here on earth may truly be ſaid to bee viſible. Thus you ſee how great ambiguity there is in the ſenſe of theſe few words, *The Church of Rome is a true and truly viſible Church.*

Now in the ſecond place, to apply all this to our preſent purpoſe. Although diuerſe men doe ſet the ſtate of this queſtion diuerſly, as may beſt ſerue for their owne priuate ends and purpoſes: yet I will take it in the largeſt extent, and as it may bee moſt fauourable for the

the Church of Rome: Thus; *Whether the Catholike Church of Rome (as it is called in opposition to the Dioces) in regard of the whole body thereof compounded of Clergy and Laity, bee still within the covenant of Gods saving grace: and haue such markes of that covenant still abiding in it, that though properly at once, and all together it cannot bee visible, yet by peece-meale, and successively, it may truly be said so to be.* And so much for the state of the question and his first disorder. His second point of disorder is in misplacing his owne arguments; which I take not as if it were done ignorantly, as not knowing what hee should haue done; (for hee excuseth himselfe for it, supposing it superfluous to doe it) but artificially for his best aduantage; It seemes hee trusted more to the gentlenesse of his aduersaries, and to his owne abilitie in opposing them; then to the strength of his owne, and his power to maintaine them; and so brings them in as it were by way of ambush. But howsoeuer it hath pleased him to proceed; I may not passe them

ouer

ouer in this place without tryall; vnleſs I would incurre the ſame ſuſpition: Let vs ſee therefore how hee proueth the negatiue.

His firſt argument, (wherein he placeth his greateſt confidence) is briefly propounded pag. 24. but more at large pag. 90. of his Aduertiſement, and it lyeth thus.

That Church which denieth, yea accurſeth, the ſauing faith of Ieſus Chriſt vnto Iuſtification; allowing only ſuch a faith which can neuer ſaue a man, but is a graceleſſe faith, ſeparable from grace, and which a man may carie with him into Hell; that is an Apoſtatized Church; vtterly falne away from Chriſt, wherein no ſaluation is to be found, or hoped for:

But the Church of Rome doth all this: Ergo.

To which I anſwer; by denying all: I deny the propoſition, becauſe it is ſophiſticall: The aſſumption, becauſe it is falſe: and I need not then doubt to deny the concluſion. The propoſition is ſick of that Sophiſme, which the Logicians

gicians call *ſecundum plures interrogationes*, or *propoſitiones*: that is, when many Propoſitions are ioyned together in one, whereof ſome are true, ſome falſe: as here are at leaſt three. One, that the Church (ſo bablingly deſcribed) is an apoſtatiſed Church: another, that it is vtterly fallen away from Chriſt: a third, that no ſaluation is to be found or hoped for therein. Of which the firſt onely is true, and the reſt notoriouſly falſe, and againſt the Scripture: for firſt, to denie, yea to accurſe ſauing Faith, & to allow the contrary, is not a point of totall & finall Apoſtaſie, vnles it be ioyned with malice and obſtinacie; and be the ſinne againſt the holy Ghoſt, to which repentance is vtterly denyed. Elſe what ſhall wee ſay of *S. Peter* who both denyed and curſed the knowledge of Chriſt in himſelfe. Secondly, if this be true, (as it is) then may ſaluation be found, and hoped for, notwithſtanding that deniall, curſing, and approbation. Thirdly, it muſt be remembred, that our queſtion is of the whole body of the Church, that is, neither of the popular

pular part onely, nor of the repreſentatiue onely, but of both together: if then the one part onely ſhall doe as he ſaith, and not the whole body, who can ſay that there is no ſaluation to bee found therein, or that it is vtterly falne away from Chriſt. So much for the Propoſition.

In the next place I ſay the Aſſumption is euidently falſe, if not more then ſlanderous: For firſt the Church of *Rome* (whether partially, or wholly vnderſtood) neuer denyed, neuer accurſed ſauing and iuſtifying Faith, nor euer allowed a graceleſſe faith onely which cannot ſaue, &c. Looke vpon all the Canons of the Councell of *Trent*, and ſee whether any ſuch thing bee to bee found therein, or gathered therefrom: doth it not diſtinguiſh betweene a liuing and a dead faith? And doth it not ſay that the liuing Faith only iuſtifieth, and not the dead? what is it then that it denyeth and accurſeth? It is this, firſt, the forme and manner of Iuſtification by Faith: when it is ſaid to iuſtifie as the very forme of Iuſtification, and not

as

as a meere disposition thereto. Secondly this assertion, that a dead faith separate from grace is not a true faith, though it cannot iustifie: this is that which the Counsell denyeth and accurseth in this case, and no more; yet you say boldly if not impudently, *pag.* 25. *If any dare deny this hee will but bewray his shameleſſe ignorance in this point.* In what point *M. Burton? That the Councell of Trent admitteth of no other faith then that which the Deuils and damned in hell haue?* O mouth! O forehead! Haue they a liuing Faith, which is fruitfull in good workes? Such a Faith as *S. Iames* commendeth? And doth not the Councell admit of this Faith? yea of this onely for Iustification? Reade the latter part of the seuenth Chapter of the sixt Session, and bee ashamed. Secondly, say the Counsell had done so indeed; Doth the whole Church of *Rome* doe it? Doth the popular part therof doe it? By your owne words, *page* 25. they denie it. Yea but they beleeue as the Church beleeues. True, but with a secret condition, If

the

the Church beleeue well, and in that onely wherein it beleeueth aright: Being deceiued in nothing, but that they truſt the Church too much; for if they could be perſwaded ſhee beleeueth amiſſe in any thing, therein they would not beleeue as ſhe doth. But you will proue that *Romes* iuſtifying faith is different in kinde from the true ſaving Faith of Chriſt. How? Can you tell? Marry thus.

That faith which Chriſt commendeth for the onely true ſaving faith, doth ſo iuſtifie a man that hee ſhall neuer come into condemnation, but paſſe from death vnto life:

But the onely faith which the Church of Rome alloweth doth not ſo.

Ergo, Aduertiſement. pag. 91.

I anſwere: A Papiſt, or Arminian would denie the Propoſition; but I grant it, and deny the Aſſumption: for let the Church of *Rome* confeſſe what ſhe will in her owne wrong; I ſay, that that faith which the Church of *Rome* onely alloweth for iuſtification (*viz.* a liuing faith fruitfull in good workes)

doth

doth ſo ſaue, and iuſtifie a man, that hee cannot goe with it into condemnation: and dare you ſay the contrary? This is his firſt Argument.

The ſecond is this:

That Church which cleaueth to Antichriſt as her head, whence ſhe receiueth all her ſpirituall life, is no true Church; nor hath any ſaluation to be found, or hoped for in her.

But the Church of Rome doth ſo.

Ergo. Aduertiſement. *pag.* 91. 92.

I denie the Aſſumption; Not for that I denie the Pope to be Antichriſt, or for that I would ſupport the church of *Rome* in any of her abominations: but firſt, becauſe the church of *Rome* doth not acknowledge the Pope to be Antichriſt, and ſo cleaueth not to him as her head in that name: Secondly, becauſe, although ſome Popes haue antichriſtianly ſaid, that all ſpirituall grace and life is deriued from the Pope, and that ſome of their Parafites haue flatteringly acknowledged it, yet neither the repreſentatiue church of *Rome* by it ſelfe, nor the popular by it ſelfe, much leſſe the whole

whole and entire body did euer yeeld vnto it; but haue from time to time oppoſed themſelues againſt it: eſpecially if the queſtion be of an abſolute, ſoueraigne, and ſupreme head; and not of a ſubordinate and miniſteriall head, as you propound it: Thirdly, becauſe in theſe ſpiritual things there is ſuch a coniunction of good and euill in this life, that though the one cannot be ſeparated from the other, yet the one is not confounded with the other; ſo as each of them receiues its life ſeuerally from its owne head, and not from the head of the other: As it is in the regenerate man, in whom the fleſh and the ſpirit are alwaies companions in this life; yet ſo, as the fleſh receiueth nothing from the holy Ghoſt, nor the ſpirit from *Adams* tranſgreſſion. And ſo is it in the caſe wee haue in hand: for in the church of *Rome* there is an inſeparable coniunction of *Babylon* and the people of God, yet ſo as *Babylon* receiues no grace from Chriſt, nor the people of GOD apoſtatiſe from the Pope, for being members of both in diuers reſpects,

ſpects, they haue grace from the one, and apoſtaſie from the other, which in them are indeed nothing but fleſh and ſpirit: And ſo much for his ſecond Argument.

The third, pag. 34. hereof, is thus framed: *A true viſible Church hath the true markes of a true viſible Church:*

But the Church of Rome hath not theſe true markes. Ergo.

The Aſſumption whereof being to be denyed, hee proueth it partly from the doctrine of the Church of England, and partly from *Bellarmine* the mouth of the Church of Rome. For the Church of England, the Homily for Whitſunday ſaith: *The true Church of Chriſt hath alwayes three notes or marks whereby it is knowne: Pure and ſound doctrine, &c. Now if you would compare this with the Church of Rome, &c.* To which I anſwer, That theſe words muſt receiue a fauourable conſtruction; or elſe they make as much againſt him, as againſt vs; and with ſuch conſtruction they make more for vs, then for him.

And what is this construction? First, they must bee vnderstood of the accidentall truth of the Church in regard of soundnesse, (as the words doe expresly import) and not of essentiall truth in regard of Gods Couenant: Secondly, they must bee vnderstood euen of soundnesse comparatiuely, and not simply, that is, in regard of the Primitiue Church, and not otherwise. Else hee must grant, that the Church of Rome hath not beene a true visible Church these nine hundred yeares: whereas he allowes it to haue beene so till the Councell of Trent, as appeareth in all this Discourse.

Now for *Bellarmine*, I am sory such a superficiall Reader should meddle with him, to the shame of our whole Nation. Marke how hee reasoneth; *Bellarmine* disclaimeth these three as proper markes of the Church: *Ergo* the Church of Rome hath them not. I pray what consequence is here? First may not a man disclaime that which he hath, for some sinister respects best knowne to himselfe? as pride, and presumption

ſumption in medling in cauſes, and with perſons too high for him, and the like? Secondly, doth *Bellarmine* diſclaime them ſimply, and not onely in compariſon of meere proper markes? Thirdly, may not the Church of Rome haue them as markes common to all Churches, true and falſe; though not as proper to the true Church? Fourthly, doth not *Bellarmine De Eccleſ. lib. 3. cap. 2. § Noſtra autem ſententia* (contradicting himſelfe) put theſe three into the definition of the Church? and doth hee not by them diſtinguiſh the Church from all other ſorts of men whatſoeuer? *Profeſſione veræ fidei, Sacramentorum communione, ſubiectione ad proprium Paſtorem?* Fiftly, is it not a Maxime of *Bellarmines, lib. 1. de Sacrament. in genere cap. 26. §. Reſpondeo, Sacramenta*, that the Sacraments and the word of God, and the reſt, *ſemper ſolius eſſe Eccleſiæ, etiamſi interdum extra Eccleſiam inueniantur?* what dealing then is this, to play the Sophiſter ſo palpably *à dicto ſecundum quid, ad dictum ſimpliciter?* This is his third Ar-

gument. The fourth you ſhall finde pag. 35. to this purpoſe:

If the Church of Rome cannot demonſtrate it ſelfe to bee a true Church, then it is no true Church:

But it cannot: Ergo.

To this many things are to be anſwered; becauſe both propoſitions are to be denyed: The former, becauſe it is inconſequent: Firſt, becauſe want of demonſtration takes not away the truth and true being of any thing; if it did, there are infinite things in the world, which ſhould haue no being, or not be that which they are; euen the Scripture it ſelfe ſhould not be the word of God, becauſe it cannot be demonſtrated ſo to be, to a naturall man. Secondly, becauſe want of ability to make demonſtration, eſpecially of the parties owne being, is much leſſe able to doe it: for how many millions of men and women are there in the world, which ſhould ceaſe to be that they are, if that were true? being vtterly vnable to demonſtrate themſelues ſo to be? The latter propoſition is to be denyed, becauſe it

is

is vntrue: for if by demonſtration, you meane, the proofe of thoſe three marks mentioned in the Homily; the church of Rome can by them demonſtrate her ſelfe to be a true Church (according to the kinde and proportion of truth) as well as any other Church: And all that will acknowledge her to bee a true Church, will and muſt acknowledge her to haue the true markes of the true Church, in the ſame degree of truth, wherein ſhe is acknowledged to bee a true Church.

But you can proue by two arguments, that ſhe cannot doe it: Firſt, becauſe *Bellarmine* is conſtrained to confeſſe, that all his 15. markes cannot make it euidently true, but onely euidently credible that it is a true Church: I anſwer, Firſt this is not true; *Bellarmine* ſaith no ſuch thing: hee hath not the word *Onely*: but thus he ſpeaketh; *Though they make it not euidently true, yet doe they make it euidently credible*: yea hee diſtinguiſheth betweene Heathens which admit not the Scriptures, and Chriſtians which doe; and ſaith,

that to them it makes them euidently credible; but to theſe euidently true as well as euidently credible: *Lib. 4. de notis Eccleſ. cap. 3 §. Dicimus ergo.* This therefore is not good dealing. Secondly, this is the ſame fallacy of arguing *à dicto ſecundum quid, ad dictum ſimpliciter*, wherein you offended afore:

He cannot doe it by theſe his fifteene markes (ſay you:)

Ergo, he cannot doe it at all.

Is this a good kinde of reaſoning? Indeed it argueth his folly, or rather madneſſe in forſaking thoſe markes, which can demonſtrate it, and cleauing to thoſe which cannot doe it; but it doth not proue that he cannot doe it by any other meanes.

In the ſecond place therefore you indeauour to proue it by Romes owne doctrine, and confeſſion: about her baptiſme, (the onely relique (ſay you) which ſome ſuppoſe is ſufficient to proue her a true Church) which is this, *That the efficacy of baptiſme depends vpon the Prieſts intention; whereof becauſe no man can be certaine, therefore no man*

can

can bee certaine whether hee were rightly baptised; and so cannot bee certaine that he is a true member of the Church. From which confession you reason thus:

That which no one Papist can demonstrate, all of them put together cannot demonstrate;

But no one of them can demonstrate himselfe to be a true member of the Church: Ergo, not all together.

And what then?

That Church whose members either severally or together cannot demonstrate themselues to bee members of the true Church, cannot demonstrate her selfe to be a true Church:

But the members of the Church of Rome, neither severally, nor together can doe it:

Ergo, She her selfe cannot doe it.

That I may giue a full and sufficient answer to this large argument, which is taken from Romes owne doctrine and confession: I must signifie vnto him, that it seemes to me that he knowes not what Romes doctrine and confession in this point is: First therefore hee must

know, that the Church of Rome hath not yet determined fully what the intention of the Priest in baptising, or of the Bishop in ordaining is: They say indeed, that a virtuall intention is sufficient, without the actuall, or habituall: But what is that virtuall intention? Some say, that the very pronouncing of the words, *I baptise thee, &c.* are sufficient thereto; *Nec aliud requiri ex parte ministri*, and that there is no more required on the behalfe of the Minister: So *Thomas*, *Part.* 3. *de Sacr. qu.* 64. *art.* 8. *ad* 2. and so *Catharine* the Bishop of *Minori* in the Councell of Trent, held and affirmed. And *Bellarmine* himselfe, though of the contrary opinion, (*viz.* that the inward intention of the Priest is required) yet is constrained to distinguish *de perfectione Sacramenti, simpliciter, & absolutè*; & *de perfectione eiusdem coram hominibus*, and so agreeth, that if we respect the perfection of the Sacrament before men, the outward prolation of the words is sufficient. *Lib.* 1. *de Sacr. in genere, cap.* 28. §. *Ad locum obiectum.*

Second-

Secondly, hee must know what certainty it is which the Church of Rome meaneth, when she confesseth that no man can be certaine of the intention of the Priest: for shee distinguisheth of certainty in this case: One is certainty of faith, which is infallible; another humane, and morall; the former shee confesseth cannot ordinarily bee had: but the latter may: which she accounteth to be sufficient, and this comes full to *Vega*, who denieth infallible certaintie of saluation, becauſe, no man can haue infallible certainty of the truth of his baptisme, for want of the like certainty of the Priests intention: but on the contrary, for morall and coniecturall certainty, he acknowledgeth that a man may and ought to haue it of the Priests intention, (vnleſſe hee declare his naughty minde by some outward signe) and so of the truth of his baptisme, and lastly of his owne saluation. For which distinction see *Bellarmine vbi supra. §. Respondeo, non debere homines.*

These things premised, his Argu-

ments

ments are easily answered. First therefore the Assumption of the last is denied: for they professe themselues able to demonstrate both seuerally and together that they are true members of the true Church; because they haue sufficient certaintie of the truth of their Baptisme; because they haue a like sufficient certaintie of the Priests intention leauing secrets vnto God; and so all that is builded hereon, that the Church cannot demonstrate her selfe to bee a true Church, falls flat to the ground; which may also be said of the intention of the Bishop in ordaining. Secondly, how can hee proue his Assumption, vnlesse he goe through all the Church of *Rome* from man to man, and from woman to woman, and examine what they can say for the truth of their Baptisme. It is twenty to one, but some one or other can shew a Reuelation, that the Priest had an actuall intention to doe as the Church doth in baptising him. Thirdly, they say they can say as much to assure them of the Priests intention in their Baptisme, as we which are baptised

tiled in our infancie, can say to assure vs that we were baptised: which is onely the Church booke, and testimonie of our Parents, Godfathers, Godmothers and other friends, which is onely humane, morall & conjecturall assurance, and not diuine and infallible. *See Bellarmine vbi supra. & Et-Nota.* So much for the fourth.

The last Argument *pag.* 32. is this:

That Church which wants the ordinary meanes of saluation, is no true Church:

But the Church of Rome wants the ordinary meanes of saluation, the preaching and hearing of the Gospell: yea it teacheth hers, to hate and abhorre it, and to call it heresie.

Ergo.

I answer: they want it, & they want it not: They hate it, and they hate it not: They want and hate the soundnes, and puritie thereof, as it is enioyed in the Reformed Churches; but they neither want nor hate it, as it is corrupted by their owne traditions, which cannot wholly deprive it of all sauing vertue,

as hath been already prooued. And why (I pray) should wee not bee content in common commiseration to beare with them in this case; as we doe with those people which dwell in fenny, foggy & marish grounds, and countries, who comming into places of fresh ayre, and healthy dyet, doe complaine that it is not good nor wholsome, because it agrees not with their more grosse constitution? If another man liue by poysoned meates, I will not enuie him, so long as I feede on that which is sound, and mans meate (as wee say.) And so much for his Arguments.

Thus haue I shewed *M^r. Burtons* second point of disorder in misplacing his Argumentes; and haue (as well as I can) righted it, and answered them. The third and last followes, which are his idle Repetitions, and Tautologies; which if they were taken out of his booke, it would bee by the one halfe, lesse then it is: as will appeare by the answer to the particulars.

Now heere I must craue fauor of the Christian Reader, that (being constrai-

ned

ned by the misbehauiour of our aduer-
ſary, to lay open his foule ouer-ſights,
in charging the Church of *Rome*, the
Councell of *Trent*, and *Bellarmine* with
vntruths, which hee ought not to haue
done) hee would not ſuppoſe me to be
any whit inclining or addicted to Pope-
rie (as the manner of the world is now-
a dayes.) No: I praiſe God I am as farr
from Popery, as *M. Burton* himſelfe is
or can be. But I would not haue men
eyther to maintaine bad cauſes againſt
the Church of *Rome*, or to maintaine
good cauſes with bad arguments, and
leaſt of all to maintaine bad cauſes with
worſe arguments, (as Iknow too many
haue done to our no little diſaduan-
tage.) It is an excellent point of man-
hood to let the enemy haue his vtmoſt
due; and not to ſeeke to ouercome him
by baſe and cowardly meanes. This I
deſire, and haue alwayes endeuoured;
and this is all which hitherto I haue
done in this Treatiſe, or purpoſe to doe
hereafter. And if the good Reader will
be pleaſed to beleeue mee, and to grant
me this reaſonable motion, I hope hee
ſhall

that to them it makes them euidently credible; but to these euidently true as well as euidently credible: *Lib. 4. de notis Eccles. cap. 3 § Dicimus ergo.* This therefore is not good dealing. Secondly, this is the same fallacy of arguing *à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*, wherein you offended afore:

He cannot doe it by these his fifteene markes (say you:)

Ergo, he cannot doe it at all.

Is this a good kinde of reasoning? Indeed it argueth his folly, or rather madnesse in forsaking those markes, which can demonstrate it, and cleaving to those which cannot doe it; but it doth not proue that he cannot doe it by any other meanes.

In the second place therefore you indeauour to proue it by Romes owne doctrine, and confession: about her baptisme, (the onely relique (say you) which some suppose is sufficient to proue her a true Church) which is this, *That the efficacy of baptisme depends vpon the Priests intention; whereof because no man can be certaine, therefore no man*

can

can bee certaine whether bee were rightly baptised; and so cannot bee certaine that he is a true member of the Church. From which confession you reason thus:

That which no one Papist can demonstrate, all of them put together cannot demonstrate;

But no one of them can demonstrate himselfe to bee a true member of the Church: Ergo, not all together.

And what then?

That Church whose members either severally or together cannot demonstrate themselues to bee members of the true Church, cannot demonstrate her selfe to be a true Church:

But the members of the Church of Rome, neither severally, nor together can doe it:

Ergo, She her selfe cannot doe it.

That I may giue a full and sufficient answer to this large argument, which is taken from Romes owne doctrine and confession: I must signifie vnto him, that it seemes to me that he knowes not what Romes doctrine and confession in this point is: First therefore hee must

know, that the Church of Rome hath not yet determined fully what the intention of the Priest in baptising, or of the Bishop in ordaining is: They say indeed, that a virtuall intention is sufficient, without the actuall, or habituall: But what is that virtuall intention? Some say, that the very pronouncing of the words, *I baptise thee, &c.* are sufficient thereto; *Nec aliud requiri ex parte ministri*, and that there is no more required on the behalfe of the Minister: So *Thomas, Part. 3. de Sacr. qu. 64. art. 8. ad 2.* and so *Catharine* the Bishop of *Minori* in the Councell of Trent, held and affirmed. And *Bellarmine* himselfe though of the contrary opinion, (*viz.* that the inward intention of the Priest is required) yet is constrained to distinguish *de perfectione Sacramenti, simpliciter, & absolutè; & de perfectione eiusdem coram hominibus*, and so agreeth, that if we respect the perfection of the Sacrament before men, the outward prolation of the words is sufficient. *Lib. 1. de Sacr. in genere, cap. 28. §. Ad locum obiectum.*

Second-

Secondly, hee must know what certainty it is which the Church of Rome meaneth, when she confesseth that no man can be certaine of the intention of the Priest: for shee distinguisheth of certainty in this case: One is certainty of faith, which is infallible; another humane, and morall; the former shee confesseth cannot ordinarily bee had: but the latter may: which she accounteth to be sufficient, and this comes full to *Vega*, who denieth infallible certaintie of salvation, becaufe, no man can haue infallible certainty of the truth of his baptisme, for want of the like certainty of the Priests intention: but on the contrary, for morall and coniecturall certainty, he acknowledgeth that a man may and ought to haue it of the Priests intention, (vnlesse hee declare his naughty minde by some outward signe) and so of the truth of his baptisme, and lastly of his owne saluation. For which distinction see *Bellarmine, vbi supra. §. Respondeo, non debere homines.*

These things premised, his Argu-

ments

ments are easily answered. First therefore the Assumption of the last is denied: for they professe themselues able to demonstrate both seuerally and together that they are true members of the true Church; because they haue sufficient certaintie of the truth of their Baptisme; because they haue a like sufficient certaintie of the Priests intention, leauing secrets vnto God; and so all that is builded hereon, that the Church cannot demonstrate her selfe to bee a true Church, falls flat to the ground; which may also be said of the intention of the Bishop in ordaining. Secondly, how can hee proue the Assumption, vnlesse he goe through all the Church of *Rome* from man to man, and from woman to woman, and examine what they can say for the truth of their Baptisme. It is twenty to one, but some one or other can shew a Reuelation, that the Priest had an actuall intention to doe as the Church doth in baptising him. Thirdly, they say they can say as much to assure them of the Priests intention in their Baptisme, as we which are baptised

tiled in our infancie, can say to assure vs that we were baptised: which is onely the Church booke, and testimonie of our Parents, Godfathers, Godmothers and other friends, which is onely humane, morall & conjecturall assurance, and not diuine and infallible. *See Bellarmine vbi supra. § Et Nota.* So much for the fourth.

The last Argument *pag.* 32. is this:

That Church which wants the ordinary meanes of saluation, is no true Church:

But the Church of Rome wants the ordinary meanes of saluation, the preaching and hearing of the Gospell: yea it teacheth hers, to hate and abhorre it, and to call it heresie.

Ergo.

I answer, they want it, & they want it not: They hate it, and they hate it not: They want and hate the soundnes, and puritie thereof, as it is enioyed in the Reformed Churches; but they neither want nor hate it, as it is corrupted by their owne traditions, which cannot wholly deprive it of all saving vertue,

as

as hath been already prooued. And why (I pray) should wee not bee content in common commiseration to beare with them in this case; as we doe with those people which dwell in fenny, foggy & marish grounds, and countries, who comming into places of fresh ayre, and healthy dyet, doe complaine that it is not good nor wholsome, because it agrees not with their more grosse constitution? If another man liue by poysoned meates, I will not enuie him, so long as I feede on that which is found, and mans meate (as wee say.) And so much for his Arguments.

Thus haue I shewed *Mr. Burtons* second point of disorder in misplacing his Arguments; and haue (as well as I can) righted it, and answered them. The third and last followes, which are his idle Repetitions, and Tautologies; which if they were taken out of his booke, it would bee by the one halfe, lesse then it is: as will appeare by the answer to the particulars.

Now here I must craue fauor of the Christian Reader, that (being constrained

ned by the misbehauiour of our aduer-
ſary, to lay open his foule ouer-ſights,
in charging the Church of *Rome*, the
Councell of *Trent*, and *Bellarmine* with
vntruths, which hee ought not to haue
done) hee would not ſuppoſe me to be
any whit inclining or addicted to Pope-
rie (as the manner of the world is now-
a dayes.) No: I praiſe God I am as farr
from Popery, as *M. Burton* himſelfe is
or can be. But I would not haue men
eyther to maintaine bad cauſes againſt
the Church of *Rome*, or to maintaine
good cauſes with bad arguments, and
leaſt of all to maintaine bad cauſes with
worſe arguments, (as I know too many
haue done to our no little diſaduan-
tage.) It is an excellent point of man-
hood to let the enemy haue his vtmoſt
due; and not to ſeeke to ouercome him
by baſe and cowardly meanes. This I
deſire, and haue alwayes endeuoured;
and this is all which hitherto I haue
done in this Treatiſe, or purpoſe to doe
hereafter. And if the good Reader will
be pleaſed to beleeue mee, and to grant
me this reaſonable motion; I hope hee
ſhall

shall perceiue that I haue not abused either him, or mine aduersary, or my cause, or my *Lord*, (whose cause I haue vndertaken) or my selfe in vndertaking it: and so I proceede.

BVRTON.

Before wee proceede to the third Vial, for the fuller confirmation of what hath beene said of the estate of the church of Rome, whose Sea of doctrine is all turned into mortall blood in the second viall: it will bee very requisite here to discusse one question:

Whether the Church of *Rome* be eyther a true Church, or a true visible Church?

Answer.

Here is a long *Exordium* to a short Cause: of which it may truely be said, *Causa incepit, Exordium vitiosum*: Such a Cause, such an *Exordium*, Such a Cup, such a Couer. In which (containing a whole leafe) hee craueth fauour and attention, after the manner of the Orators, from three Rhetoricall arguments: The qualitie of the question: His owne good handling thereof: and

The

The condition of his owne person. The question affords him two favourable arguments: One, for that it is requisite to be discussed in this place: Another, for that it is waightie and of great moment. The necessitie of the discussion is for the fuller confirmation of that hee hath said of the Church of *Rome*. And indeede it is very necessary that hee proue, and that very substantially and soundly (as hee saith in the words following) *That the Church of Rome is neyther a true, nor a true visible Church*; or else all hee hath said is not worth a rush. For if it be, then is not her Sea of Doctrines turned into mortall blood in this second Viall: nor the Councell of *Trent* this Sea of mortall blood, nor *Chemnitius* the Angell, nor any thing soas hee hath said. But marke here (I pray) his Circulation: Before, he proued the Church of *Rome* to bee no true Church, because all her doctrines are mortall: and now hee proues all her doctrines to be mortall, because thee is no true Church; which manner of reasoning goes for currant with him, in all this

this part of his Treatise. But let that passe. Now if his answers proue no better then his arguments haue done (as I doubt they will not,) it had beene farre more requisite for him to haue left this question altogether indiscussed in this place, and to haue proceeded directly to the third Viall without any more adoe; for so both hee and his followers might haue fallen into the ditch without any obseruation; whereas now all the world must take notice thereof to their shame and discredit.

BVRTON.

A question of so much the greater moment, by how much some, by their no small authoritie, and no lesse renowned opinion in the Church, doe so sway the ballance on that side, that many ill affected, & of the aduerse party, taking the aduantage, are apt to catch the word out of their mouth, and to say, Thy mother Church of Rome, &c.

Answer.

This is the second Argument by which the Question begs him some fauour; for indeed it cannot be denyed

to

to be very waightie, tending either to the admiſſion or expulſion of many millions of ſoules eyther into, or out of the Church of Chriſt: But both his comparatiue amplification, and his Rhetoricall anticipation (by the one whereof hee would breede enuy to his aduerſaries, not onely for oppreſſing the truth with their authoritie, and eſtimation in the Church; but alſo for giuing a perillous, and vnſeaſonable aduantage to the Papiſts, and popiſhly affected: and by the other would free himſelfe and his from fault) I ſay both of theſe doe admit many, and thoſe very iuſt exceptions. For firſt, who are thoſe ſome in authoritie in the Church, of whom he ſpeaketh? I doubt not but hee meaneth his elect aduerſaries, & other reuerend Fathers, and Miniſters of our Church, who are of a contrary opinion to him: But our worthy fellow, and friend, *M. William Bedle* (now Rector of the Colledge and Vniuerſitie of Dublme) in his Letters to *Wadſworth, pag. 75.* tels him, and that in truth, *That this opinion is not onely fauoured of many great*

Scholars in England, but is the common opinion of all the best Diuines of the Reformed Churches that are, or haue beene in the world. And it is so well known to the common Aduersaries, that *Brierley* in his Apologie of the Romane Church, *Tract. 1. Sect. 6. Subdiuis. 3.* And *Smith* in his booke of the Author and essence of the Protestant Church and Religion, *Lib. 1. cap. 2.* haue made whole Catalogues of them; wherein you shall finde truly billed, *The Augustane Confession, Luther, Caluin, Iunius, Zanchius, Plessaus, Bucanus, Polanus, Saravia, Boysseul, Vorstius,* and *Martyr:* And of our owne, *King Iames, Andrewes, Hooker, Gowell, Whitaker, Moreton, Feild, Powel, Reinolds, White,* and *Hall* our reuerend Diocesan, our ioy & crowne, and your meeke, and sweet spirited aduersary, as you truly call him, *pag. 52.* To whom they adde by necessary consequence many more, as *Beza, Melancthon, Pappus, Schusselburge, Ioannes Regius, Leonardus Crentremius, Whitgift, Lubbertus, Brentius, Magdeburgenses, Daneus, Iuel, Fulk, Bale, Zuinglius,*

Zuinglius, Bucer, Molinæus, Bell, Mason, Sadeel, yea and *Perkins* himselfe, who of all the rest seemes to be furthest off from this opinion; but these they adde, because they allow them the Couenant, the calling of Pastors, the holding of all the necessary points of the foundation, and saluation it selfe, which being granted, the true Church cannot be denyed vnto them.

Loe these are the some, which sway the ballance on the contrary side to you, being indeed of no small authority, and no less renownd opinion in the church; And not some few in our Church of note and authority, as you would insinuate.

Secondly, who are those many ill affected, and of the aduerse partie, who take aduantage hereof? and when did they do it? you would make the world beleeue that this were a new thing occasioned by these some in authority, whom you haue made your aduersaries: But they are no lesse then the whole Church of Rome, and that euen from our first separation from her, as may

appeare by the Apologies of all the reformed Churches; and by *Bellarmines* thirteenth note of the Church *de Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 16. Sect. Idem de Hæreticis.* herein therefore you are greatly to bee blamed.

Thirdly, what is the aduantage which they take? and what is the perill thereof? doubtlesse some extraordinarie thing (I warrant you) neuer heard of, before these men gaue it in these lukewarme, indifferent, neutralizing dayes; *Thy Mother Church of Rome; forsooth:* A perillous aduantage, I promise you; To acknowledge that truth in lukewarme times, which was alwayes openly knowne and professed: For who euer denyed, but wee were sometimes members of that Church? and with what face can it be denied? of which I may well say, (as Saint *Paul* said in another case) if it be perilous, it is perilous to them that perish, in whom the god of this world hath blinded their eyes that they should beleeue lyes, because they neuer entertained the truth in loue; and if to them it bee perilous,

let

let it be perilous; their blood be vpon their owne heads: If we testifying our loue and good opinion of them in the bowells of Christ Iesus; they turne it to their owne perdition; wee are not vnder bondage in this case: But if any aduantage be to be taken in this respect, vndoubtedly (saith worthy *Bedel, vbi supra*) we haue it of them, and not they of vs; in that what we doe, we doe it of charity; but they of ignorance, or malice, or both.

BVRTON.

Popery hath learned to get ouer the stile againe fast enough without our helpe.

Answer.

Master *Burton*; do we helpe Popery (as it were an old dogge) ouer the stile againe, in acknowledging this truth? No, this is *Non causa pro causa*. If this would haue helped, the stile had neuer beene made; that which helpeth it ouer is the iust iudgement of God for our sinnes, and especially for the contempt of the sincere truth of the Gospell: and not the maintaining of any truth: let

vs truly repent of them, and I dare be bold to say in the name of God, that, This shall neuer helpe Popery more either now, or hereafter, then it hath done alwaies heretofore.

BVRTON.

Though it were true, that the church of Rome were a true Church, yet the countenancing or pressing of it in these times might very well be spared.

Answer.

Indeed you are the onely religious Politician of these times, and know better what is to bee done in these cases, then they that sit at the sterne: There is no man so senslesse (I suppose) but he knowes, that all truths are not either to be published, vrged, or countenanced at all times. *There is a time for all things,* (saith *Salomon*) *A time to keepe silence, and a time to speake.* But when these times are, it were farre better for you, and me, and all priuate persons to leaue to the wisedome of our Gouernours, then to prescribe any thing to them therein: But now adayes all men will be Priuy Councellors, and he is a

very dolt, that cannot gouern the whole State, Church, and Kingdome, far better then now it is gouerned. So much for the amplification.

BVRTON.

But why then (say they) doe others cry downe the Church of Rome for no true Church at all? Surely, this was a fault, if it were an vntruth: For giue the deuill his due (as we say.) It is good therefore that all men be well aduised in this point, in speaking of the Church of Rome pro or contra, *as a true church or no; it being a matter not to be maintained by finenesse of wit, or quaint rhetoricall discourse, but vpon sound ground, & substantiall demonstration.*

Answer.

This is your anticipation; wherein you answer a supposed obiection, thereby to free your selfe from fault in tying downe the truth, and true visibility of the Church of Rome; It is no fault (say you) because it is no truth: But you know that is the question: And besides, haue you so soone forgotten your owne policy? That though it were

true, yet the countenancing, or pressing of it in these times might very well bee spared? Can you imagine that in these lukewarme, indifferent, neutralizing dayes, you shall not find enow that will take vp the bucklers against you? will you giue the onset, and bee faultlesse? and shall they only that oppose you be the offenders? there is no reason at all for that; In a mutiny it is hard but both sides will bee found faulty: well then; *Let the Deuill haue his due* (say you; and so say I too) *yet it is good* (say you) *that all men be well aduised in this point, &c.* Let this word stand: Only I craue that it may not be taken for granted (which you rhetorically beg of your friends,) that you haue the sound grounds, and substantiall demonstrations; and that wee haue nothing but finenesse of wit, and quaint rhetoricall discourses: and vpon these termes let the cause bee determined: And so much for the quality of the question.

BVRTON.

Now for the more cleare and full, yet briefe discussion of the point, it shall

suffice

suffice onely to answer such arguments as are vsed for it; whereupon the positiue truth will easily be concluded.

Answer.

Now you come to the second argument of your Exordium, by which you scrape acquaintance with your Readers; which is, a promise to handle this question well; that is, clearly, fully, and briefly; to which end you thinke it sufficient to answer such arguments as are vsed against you: But how you offend herein I haue showed already.

BVRTON.

Wherein I must craue pardon, hauing to deale in so weighty a cause, and with such mighty Authors, as haue already tanquam e Cathedra *defined it. But God forbid that the royall of truth should depend vpon the opinion of any mans person; though neuer so great, or esteemed in the opinion of the learned.* My brethren (*saith Saint* Iames) haue not the faith of our Lord Iesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons: *And* (*as Saint* Augustine *against* Maximi-

nus

nus *an Arrian Bishop, said)* Nec tu mihi Ariminense, nec ego tibi Nicenum Concilium objiciam, &c.

Answer.

This is the third argument taken from the condition of your person, being so weake and vnworthy to deale in such a cause, and with such Authors: wherein first you craue pardon of your boldnes, and after cleare your selfe of such imputations, as may be laid to your charge: For the former; it is counted the part of an vnwise man to craue pardon of a fault, when it is in his owne power not to offend: If it bee a fault, why would you runne into it? if it be none, why do you craue pardon? But indeed it cannot be denied to be a great fault for any man to meddle in matters too high, and with persons too great for him, if *David, Psalm.* 131. 1. and *Siracides, Ecclus.* 8. 1. say true: For as *Pyttacus* counselled his friend in the case of mariage to doe as the boies playing wth top & scourge, said one to another, [illegible] *Tu tibi sume parem*: Take to thy selfe thy peere: So is it good for euery man to

con-

contend with his match, and not to meddle with his betters, vnlesse he will befoole himselfe in the end. *But it is the triall of truth* (you say) *and God forbid that should depend vpon the opinion of any mans person.* True: But first a man must be sure of a warrant for his doing; for euery man may not contend with his betters in triall of truth vpon his owne head. Secondly, he must not behaue himselfe sawcily (as you do here) saying they haue defined the contrary, *tanquam è Cathedra*! Else it may fall out (as you say to the Papists, *pag. 24.*) that *God forbid* will not serue the turne: neither will S. *Iames* (who would not haue many masters) speake for you: nor Saint *Augustine* (who contended with his fellow Bishop) plead for you. And so much for your petition.

BVRTON.

Nor let any man here impute presumption to the weakness or vnworthinesse of my person, as though I tooke a pride to bee medling with such high matters, and wherein great ones are interessed. Alas, God knowes, I

take

take so little pride herein, &c.

Answer.

Come wee now to your purgation, wherein you cleare your selfe of pride and presumption by way of anticipation: Some man perhaps would say, *Vbi dolor, ibi digitus*; and that where men are guilty of greatest weaknesse, there they make greatest preparation; and that when a man cleares himselfe without an accuser, *Aliquid latet, quod non patet*: But seeing you call God to witnes, I had rather beleeue you, then suspect you; yet giue me leaue to tell you what I could say against you, if I were disposed; notwithstanding all you can say for your selfe to the contrary. First, *Dauid, vbi supra*, makes it an infallible note of pride to be exercised in matters and with persons of this quality. Secondly, many passages in this your second Viall (to goe no further) do send forth a ranke sauor of some such thing: as first, those words, *Though it were true, that the Church of Rome were a true Church, yet the countenancing, or pressing it in these times, might very well be spa-*

red;

red; which are very high: So those; *It is good for all men to be well aduised in this point, it being a matter not to be maintained by fineneſſe of wit, &c.* wherein you couertly praiſe your ſelfe, and diſpraiſe your aduerſaries intollerably: So thoſe, *I muſt craue pardon, hauing to deale with ſuch Authors, as haue already* tanquam e Cathedra *defined the cauſe.* Inſolent words. Then thoſe, *Cucullus non facit Monachum*; which is as much as if you had ſaid, *A Rochet makes not a Biſhop.* And thoſe, *What a ſtrange doctrine is this for a learned Doctor (and more then ſo) of the Church of England) to teach? Doth he not deſerue to be the Popes white ſonne for it?* which are words of reproach. Finally thoſe, *Now let the Reuerend Author iudge indifferently, hauing well waighed the former reaſons, whether wee doe ill or no in taking this his ſaying ill; or whether wee had not reaſon to haue expected an ingenuous Palinodia or Auguſtine like retraction, rather then ſuch an Apologie; which whether it be rather to be pitied, then any vncharitableneſſe in the reader in taking ſuch a ſaying ill; let in-*

dicious

dicious charity it selfe iudge: where may a man finde pride, if here bee none? yet for all this, you professe many things to the contrary; as first that

BVRTON.

My heart is euen torne in sunder, to see the vnfull rents of the Church of God, and the truth so opposed, so oppressed.

Answer.

But *Ieremie* tells you, the heart is deceitfull aboue measure, and the learned say, that it is not so deceitfull in any thing as in pride; in so much as if it were possible to be without pride, yet would it be proud that it is not proud: and so euen while your heart is torne in sunder with sorrow, you may be proud in exercising your selfe in things, and with persons that be too high, notwithstanding.

BVRTON.

And when Gods glory suffers, pardon mee, if I professe my selfe a poore defendent.

Answer.

What? without a calling? might not

not *Vzza* put forth his hand to ſtay the ſhaking of the Arke, and may you doe it? But wherein (I pray) doth Gods glorie ſuffer any thing in our caſe? Is it any diſhonour to God to be faithfull in keeping his couenant for euer, euen with his enemies? Is not this the higheſt point of his glorie, wherein of all the reſt he moſt glorieth? O Maſter *Burton*, pretend not the glorie of God, againſt the glory of God, there is nothing more eaſie, more vſuall, more dangerous.

BVRTON.

Yea, my profeſſion, not onely as a Chriſtian, but much more as a Miniſter of the Goſpel, bindeth me to it.

Anſwere.

Then let all Chriſtendome goe together by the eares, and let Miniſters bee the Ring-leaders and Boutefeeves.

BVRTON.

And I know that God regardeth no mans perſon.

Anſwer.

True: But he will haue all men to be ſure of a warrant for their doinge.

BVR-

BVRTON.

And as the prouerbe is, Cucullus non facit Monachum.

Answere.

Neither doth the wearing of a Lions skin, make a Lyon.

BVRTON.

And were it not a matter so nearly concerning the glory of God, and the salvation of Mens soules, I had farre rather sit mee downe in safe and sweet silence, wherein I should haue the most opportunitie to pray for the peace of Ierusalem, then any way stand vp to contend.

Answere.

Indeede this is the thing which of all other you had most need to purge your selfe of. This contentious humor which (some say) is predominant in you: for (if *Salomon* say true) a man so qualified must needes bee presumptuous. And how doe you doe it? You pretend againe the glory of God. But you haue heard, that that may be but a colour. Next, the saluation of mens soules. But how can that be, when you damne all

Pa-

Papists to the Deuill? Thirdly, your choise of priuate retiredneſſe: But that is queſtionable. Laſtly, your deuotion: But *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?*

BVRTON.

But it is Gods quarrell, and that against Babylon.

Anſwer.

Firſt, let that be proued: then let God bee a God of order, and not of confuſion.

BVRTON.

Peace is beautifull indeed; but there is a what peace? In which regard Chriſt the Prince of peace ſaid, I came not to ſend peace into the earth, but a ſword. *As faire as peace is, wee muſt not make an Idoll of it, we muſt keepe Chriſts peace.*

Anſwer.

God forbid elſe: But we muſt know then of what ſpirit we are. Wee haue had late experience of the too eager deſire of many forward ſpirits to breake our peace, and to vnſheathe the ſword: but I cannot be perſwaded that eyther

this is Chriſts ſword, or that that was not Chriſts peace.

BVRTON.

And in theſe perillous dayes it being almoſt as dangerous to bee ignorant of the myſtery of iniquitie, as of the myſtery of Godlineſſe; let no man thinke it labour ſuperfluous, or preſumptuous, to ſearch out the true myſterie of Popery.

Anſwer.

You ſay well: But firſt you muſt not doe it like *Skogan*, as well where it is not, as where it is: Then, you muſt not doe it ſo, that you take away all the myſtery thereof at one blow, by denying the Romane Church to bee a true, or true viſible Church of Chriſt: for where then is any myſterie? Is there any myſterie in Iudaiſme, Turciſme, or Paganiſme.

BVRTON.

But (I ſay) in this place a kinde of Neceſſitie hath impoſed this taske vpon mee.

Anſwer.

Hic murus ahaneus eſto. Neceſſitie, with

with a great *N.* hath impoſed this task vpon you, and woe be to you if you do it not: If you had ſaid ſo much at firſt, it had beene enough. This is that I expected all this while: but I hope I ſhall make it appeare, that this Neceſsitie was neuer of Gods impoſition. And ſo much for your Preface: Let vs now examine your ſound and ſubſtantiall Anſwers.

But here I muſt admoniſh the Reader, that he dealeth with three ſeuerall Authors: with two hee contendeth very briefly, and with a kinde of neglect, about ſaluation in the Church of Rome: with the third (being a Reuerend Antiſtes of the Church of England) hee findeth himſelfe more to do: & that (as I ſuppoſe) becauſe a kinde of Neceſsity hath impoſed this taske vpon him.

BVRTON.

The firſt maine Argument, which would conclude the Church of Rome to be a true Church, is, becauſe (ſay they) a man in that Church may be ſaued: for out of the Church no ſaluation. Therefore the Church of Rome muſt be

a true Church.

Anſwer.

Theſe words, (as ſhould ſeeme by the words *ſay they*) are common to both the former Authors: who (if they haue framed their maine argument no better) are worthy to be blamed; vnleſſe it were done popularly without ſuſpition of oppoſition; as it may very well bee ſuppoſed: The argument is this.

Out of the true Church of Chriſt there is no ſaluation:

In the Church of Rome there is ſaluation. Ergo,

The Church of Rome is not out of the true Church of Chriſt.

BVRTON.

Who are they that may bee ſaued in the Church of Rome? My Author expreſſeth, An honeſt ignorant Papiſt, or ſome ignorant ſilly ſoules, &c. yea, and this is deliuered in the name of our Church; or at leaſt of all thoſe, that being affected to the Church of Rome in ſome good meaſure, would ſeeme to bee the Church of England.

Answer.

Whether you deale well with your Authors or no I know not: for you do not seuer them so wel as you should; and indeed wee shall finde in the end, that you might well haue ioyned them together as one man; for any disagreement that can be found between them: It seemes here you haue to doe with one onely: for I must goe by guesse; not knowing wel what to make of your answer: you seeme to deny the Assumption of the Argument, by demanding who may bee saued in the Church of Rome? and then bring in your author answering in the name of the Church of England: and indeed (taking the words you haue related, in a good sense, as I doubt not but the Author meant them, and not as you misconstrue them) they may well be deliuered, not onely in the name of our Church; but of all the reformed Churches in the world.

Author.

We acknowledge an honest ignorant Papist may be saued; and we haue not so learned Christ, as to deny

ſaluation to ſome ignorant ſilly ſoules, whoſe humble peaceable obedience makes them ſafe among any part of men, that profeſſe the foundation Chriſt.

BVRTON.

This makes well for Popiſh ignorance when all failes: This alſo gives liberty to any Religion, ſo it profeſſe the foundation Chriſt, that therein a man may be ſaued.

Anſwer.

Firſt, here is a good beginning with a notable point of ſophiſtrie, *ex compoſitione dividendorum:* for he confounds two kindes of ignorance, which are as different one from another, as *membra dividentia* can be: for better vnderſtanding whereof, we are to remember, that there are two kindes of ignorance: one negatiue, another priuatiue, (as the Schoolemen ſpeake) The former is the ignorance of that which was neuer reuealed; or not reuealed ſufficiently to procure diſtinct knowledge: The latter is the ignorance of that which a man might haue knowne diſtinctly if hee would.

would, Theſe two are commonly called ſimple, & affected ignorance: Simple becauſe a man is alwaies readie to embrace the knowledge of the truth, when it ſhall pleaſe God to reueale it: Affected, becauſe a man delights in darkneſſe more then light, that his euill deeds may not be reproued: and both of theſe may befall the learnedeſt man in the world: As the former did Saint *Paul* before his conuerſion; and ſome of the Rulers of the Iewes, as Saint *Peter* teſtifieth, *Acts* 3.17. and as the latter did other of thoſe Rulers who cloſed their eyes that they might not ſee, *Mat.* 13.15. Now of theſe, the Author means the former onely, which is proteſtant ignorance as well as popiſh; and the Anſwerer abuſeth him in vnderſtanding him of the latter; which indeed is true popiſh ignorance, and no other; for then a man is popiſhly ignorant, when he pleaſeth himſelfe in his ignorance, and is taught ſo to doe; and not when hee is willing to know, if hee had the meanes: and who doubteth but there are many millions of ſuch in the

BVRTON.

And as the prouerbe is, Cucullus non facit Monachum.

Answere.

Neither doth the wearing of a Lions skin, make a Lyon.

BVRTON.

And were it not a matter so nearly concerning the glory of God, and the saluation of Mens soules, I had far rather sit mee downe in safe and sweet silence, wherein I should haue the most opportunitie to pray for the peace of Ierusalem, then any way stand vp to contend.

Answere.

Indeede this is the thing which of all other you had most need to purge your selfe of. This contentious humor which (some say) is predominant in you: for (if *Salomon* say true) a man so qualified must needes bee presumptuous: And how doe you doe it? You pretend againe the glory of God. But you haue heard that that may be but a colour. Next, the saluation of mens soules: But how can that be, when you damne all

Pa-

Papists to the Deuill? Thirdly, your choise of priuate retiredneſſe: But that is queſtionable. Laſtly, your deuotion: But *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?*

BVRTON.

But it is Gods quarrell, and that against Babylon.

Anſwer.

Firſt, let that be proued: then let God bee a God of order, and not of confuſion.

BVRTON.

Peace is beautifull indeed; but there is a what peace? In which regard Chriſt the Prince of peace ſaid, I came not to ſend peace into the earth, but a ſword. *As faire as peace is, wee muſt not make an Idoll of it, we muſt keepe Chriſts peace.*

Anſwer.

God forbid elſe: But we muſt know then of what ſpirit we are. Wee haue had late experience of the too eager deſire of many forward ſpirits to breake our peace, and to vnſheathe the ſword: but I cannot be perſwaded that eyther

this is Chriſts ſword, or that that was not Chriſts peace.

BVRTON.

And in theſe perillous dayes it being almoſt as dangerous to bee ignorant of the myſtery of iniquitie, as of the myſtery of Godlineſſe; let no man thinke it labour ſuperfluous, or preſumptuous, to ſearch out the true myſterie of Popery.

Anſwer.

You ſay well: But firſt you muſt not doe it like *Skogan*, as well where it is not, as where it is: Then, you muſt not doe it ſo, that you take away all the myſtery thereof at one blow, by denying the Romane Church to bee a true, or true viſible Church of Chriſt: for where then is any myſterie? Is there any myſterie in Iudaiſme, Turciſme, or Paganiſme.

BVRTON.

But (I ſay) in this place a kinde of Neceſſitie hath impoſed this taske vpon mee.

Anſwer.

Hic murus ahaneus eſto. Neceſſitie, with

with a great *N.* hath impoſed this task vpon you, and woe be to you if you do it not: If you had ſaid ſo much at firſt, it had beene enough. This is that I expected all this while: but I hope I ſhall make it appeare, that this Neceſsitie was neuer of Gods impoſition. And ſo much for your Preface: Let vs now examine your ſound and ſubſtantiall Anſwers.

But here I muſt admoniſh the Reader, that he dealeth with three ſeuerall Authors: with two hee contendeth very briefly, and with a kinde of neglect, about ſaluation in the Church of Rome: with the third (being a Reuerend Antiſtes of the Church of England) hee findeth himſelfe more to do: & that (as I ſuppoſe) becauſe a kinde of Neceſsity hath impoſed this taske vpon him.

BVRTON.

The firſt maine Argument, which would conclude the Church of Rome to be a true Church, is, becauſe (ſay they) a man in that Church may be ſaued: for out of the Church no ſaluation; Therefore the Church of Rome muſt be

a true Church.

Anſwer.

Theſe words, (as ſhould ſeeme by the words *ſay they*) are common to both the former Authors: who (if they haue framed their maine argument no better) are worthy to be blamed; vnleſſe it were done popularly without ſuſpition of oppoſition; as it may very well bee ſuppoſed: The argument is this.

Out of the true Church of Chriſt there is no ſaluation:

In the Church of Rome there is ſaluation. Ergo,

The Church of Rome is not out of the true Church of Chriſt.

BVRTON.

Who are they that may bee ſaued in the Church of Rome? My Author expreſſeth, An honeſt ignorant Papiſt, or ſome ignorant ſilly ſoules, &c. yea, and this is deliuered in the name of our Church; or at leaſt of all thoſe, that being affected to the Church of Rome in ſome good meaſure, would ſeeme to bee the Church of England.

Answer.

Whether you deale well with your Authors or no I know not: for you do not seuer them so wel as you should; and indeed wee shall finde in the end, that you might well haue ioyned them together as one man; for any disagreement that can be found between them: It seemes here you haue to doe with one onely: for I must goe by guesse; not knowing wel what to make of your answer: you seeme to deny the Assumption of the Argument, by demanding who may bee saued in the Church of Rome? and then bring in your author answering in the name of the Church of England: and indeed (taking the words you haue related, in a good sense, as I doubt not but the Author meant them, and not as you misconstrue them), they may well be deliuered, not onely in the name of our Church; but of all the reformed Churches in the world.

Author.

We acknowledge an honest ignorant Papist may be saued; and we haue not so learned Christ, as to deny

saluation to some ignorant silly soules, whose humble peaceable obedience makes them safe among any part of men, that professe the foundation Christ.

BVRTON.

This makes well for Popish ignorance when all failes: This also giues liberty to any Religion, so it professe the foundation Christ, that therein a man may be saued.

Answer.

First, here is a good beginning with a notable point of sophistrie, *ex compositione dividendorum:* for he confounds two kindes of ignorance, which are as different one from another, as *membra diuidentia* can be: for better vnderstanding whereof, we are to remember, that there are two kindes of ignorance: one negatiue, another priuatiue, (as the Schoolemen speake) The former is the ignorance of that which was neuer reuealed; or not reuealed sufficiently to procure distinct knowledge: The latter is the ignorance of that which a man might haue knowne distinctly if hee would.

would. These two are commonly called simple, & affected ignorance: Simple because a man is alwaies readie to embrace the knowledge of the truth, when it shall please God to reueale it: Affected, because a man delights in darknesse more then light, that his euill deeds may not be reproued: and both of these may befall the learnedest man in the world: As the former did Saint *Paul* before his conuersion; and some of the Rulers of the Iewes, as Saint *Peter* testifieth, *Acts* 3.17. and as the latter did other of those Rulers who closed their eyes that they might not see, *Mat.* 13.15. Now of these, the Author means the former onely, which is protestant ignorance as well as popish; and the Answerer abuseth him in vnderstanding him of the latter; which indeed is true popish ignorance, and no other; for then a man is popishly ignorant, when he pleaseth himselfe in his ignorance, and is taught so to doe; and not when hee is willing to know, if hee had the meanes: and who doubteth but there are many millions of such in the

Church of Rome, which are those ignorant silly soules of whom the Author speaketh.

Secondly, hee changeth the state of the question; for whereas the Author saith such ignorants may bee saued among any part of mankind that profes the foundation Christ; that is, in any Christian Church; he turnes it into any Religion professing Christ; which is not the question: for the question is of the Church, and not of the Religion: and from hence he proceeds cunningly to his first question: *Whether any Papist may bee saued by his religion:* But here let it be acknowledged, that wee agree with S. *Augustine, lib.* 1. *de Baptis. contra Donatistas:* That the societies of all Heretiques, so farre as they retaine the profession of saving truth, and the ministration of the Sacrament of Baptisme, are so farre forth still conioyned with the Catholique Church of God, which in and by them bringeth forth children vnto God: Marke his words, *Ecclesia Orthodoxa* (saith hee) *non Haresis per Christi Baptismum gene-*

rat,

rat, qui generantur filij Dei etiam inter Hæreticos.

BVRTON.

But here two questions would be resolued: First whether any Papist by his religion may be saued.

Answer.

Here hee diuideth one question into two, and maketh two Authors differ in opinion, which agree in one: And for the first question, it was neuer moued by any thing I can perceiue from his Authors. The question is, Whether any man liuing and dying a Papist, or member of the Church of Rome may be saued; and not, Whether any Papist may be saued by his religion. This therfore is a trick of Leigerdumaine, worthie such as pretend Gods glorie in hypocrisie.

BVRTON.

For resolution, The Author rankes all Papists into two sorts; either learned, or silly ignorants. For the learned, hee confesseth it, is very hard for them to be saued; but if ignorants more easie.

Answer.

Anſwer.

If his Author doe as hee ſaith; hee marres a good cauſe in the handling; but I doubt he belies him, eſpecially if this which he hath related be all that he ſaith. For theſe words doe not imply a diuiſion of all Papiſts into learned and ſilly ignorants; but of ignorant Papiſts into ſimple, and wilfull ignorants; and for the wilfull, he confeſſeth it impoſſible for them to be ſaued, (if they ſo abide,) whether they be learned or vnlearned; but the ſimple, whether learned or vnlearned (in his opinion) may be ſaued: and ſo thinke I too.

BVRTON.

So then if a Papiſt be ſaued, he may thanke his ignorance.

Anſwer.

Was there euer any man in the world which would make ſuch an inference? Saint *Paul* was a perſecutor, blaſphemer, and wrong doer, but he obtained mercy becauſe hee did it ignorantly in vnbeleefe: So then that Saint *Paul* obtained mercy, he may thanke his ignorance and vnbeleefe. *Apage.* No, this

is

is all that can bee inferred therefrom; that ſuch ignorance as this, doth not *ponere obicẽ* (as the Schoolemen ſpeake) that is, lay a blocke in the way to ſaluation, as the other doth; he may bee ſaued, notwithſtanding this ignorance, though not for this ignorance, becauſe it excuſeth *à tanto*, though not *à toto*: from the degree of ſinne, though not from all ſinne.

BVRTON.

But Chriſt the foundation is there profeſſed: well: but how will popiſh ignorance teach a man to bee ſaued by Chriſt? Faith comes by hearing: and without faith no ſaluation by Chriſt: But all Papiſts are taught to hate and abhorre the preaching of the word; how then is it poſſible they ſhould be ſaued? be they neuer ſo humble and peaceable Men.

Anſwer.

The farther, the worſe: doth it follow vpon any thing that hath been ſaid, that Popiſh ignorance will teach a man to be ſaued by Chriſt, when it hath bin renounced as damnable? Nay wee ſhould

ſhould ſhew our ſelues ideots, if wee ſhould ſay, ſimple ignorance can doe it: But how then are theſe ignorants ſaued by Chriſt? why by faith (man) which comes by hearing the word preached: yea but they haue it not, nor can haue it; yea they abhorre it, and are taught ſo to doe. Fie for ſhame, that a man ſo well ſtudied in the myſtery of iniquitie, ſhould be either ſo ignorant therein, or ſo ill affected to affirme ſo groſſe an vntruth: Reade the Councell of Trent, *Seſſ.5. cap.2. & 24. cap.4.* and ſee whether this bee true which he ſaith: It ſeemes hee hath not beene beholden to any of thoſe many Cart-loads of Homilies, Sermons, Poſtills, Meditations, Hiemals and Æſtiualls, which are ſo diligently preached in the Church of Rome, and farre better, more ſoundly, and diligently ſince that Councell, then before: To which many of our ordinary Preachers are much beholden: And I would they were not better taught there in ſome places, then ours are (*dolens dico*) in many Churches in England, Wales, and Ire-

Ireland. Indeed they are taught to hate our Preachers as heretickes, and our preaching as hereſie; but if he ſay therof that they haue none at all, or hate all, he deceiues himſelfe, and others with his old fallacie, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*: And if he ſay their preaching cannot breed true ſauing faith, I pitie him.

BVRTON.

As if a Papiſt though neuer ſo ſimple could be humble; there can be no greater pride, then that which hee takes in his ignorance; and can he be peaceable, whoſe chiefe article of his Creed is to beleeue the Pope to be ſupreme ouer all Kings and Princes, &c.

Anſwer.

If he thinke all Papiſts to bee ſuch as he ſpeakes of, hee is not onely vncharitable, but fooliſh: Thoſe ſimple and ſilly ignorants, of which the Author ſpeaketh, both may be, and are humble, and peaceable; notwithſtanding the pride and rebellion of the Popiſh ignorants; and beſides, how doth their Poperie hinder them from humilitie and peace-

peaceableneſſe, when their Kings and Princes themſelues will haue them ſo to beleeue and hold?

BVRTON.

This is the beaſts marke, which whoſo receiueth, ſhall drinke of the wine of the wrath of God, Reuel. 14. 9. No Papiſt then as a Papiſt can be ſaued.

Anſwer.

That the beleefe of the Popes ſupremacie in all ſpirituall things and cauſes, is the Beaſts marke, is *Petitio principij*. And that all Papiſts doe receiue the Beaſts marke is falſe; vnleſſe hee will ſay none of them all are written in the Lambes booke of life, *Reuel.* 13. 8. Which I thinke he dare not ſay. The Concluſion is altogether without premiſſes: for if hee will conclude any thing at all from hence, it muſt be this; *That no Papiſt can be ſaued, and not that No Papiſt as a Papiſt can be ſaued.* For the Argument lyeth thus; No man receiuing the beaſts marke can be ſaued; But all Papiſts doe receiue the Beaſts marke:

marke: *Ergo*, No papist can be saued.

BVRTON.

And of Babylon (saith God) Come out of her my people, lest ye be partakers of her sinnes, Reuel. 18. Babylon is the dominion, and religion of the beast, of Antichrist; Nothing then therein to be expected, but the punishment of Babels sinnes.

Answer.

Babylon doth not alwayes signifie the dominion, and religion of the beast: sometimes it is taken τυπικῶς, for the very Citie, that is, the seate of his dominion, the Citie of Rome, and so is it to be vnderstood, *Reuel.* 18. And for the Conclusion, I say the same I said of the former; that it hath no premisses: for all that can well be concluded is this; *That God calleth his people out of the Citie of Rome, when it is vpon the point of destruction, that they may not bodily perish with the wicked.* For I hope hee will not say that Gods people may euerlastingly perish with them; though for a time they partake with them in their sinnes,

sinnes, and temporall punishments, as often, and ordinarily they doe. So much for the first question, and for the first Author.

The second question and Author.

May not a simple Papist misled by education or long custome, or ouer-valuing the soueraignty of the Romane Church, & so in the simplicitie of his heart imbracing them, find mercy at Gods hands, by a general repentance, and faith in the merit of Christ, attended with charitie, and other vertues?

BVRTON.

Here the state of the former question is quite altered: by Faith, and Repentance no doubt, not onely an ignorant Papist, but euen an Infidell may finde mercy, &c.

Answere.

It is not true, the state it still the same, for the humble & peaceable obedience of the former question implyeth the Faith and Repentance required in this question: for without true faith and repentance

pentance, there can be no humble and peaceable obedience: And so it is true which I said before, that hee diuideth one question into two, and maketh his Authors differ, which agree in one. Besides, I would desire him to tell, why there hee denyed humilitie and peaceable behauiour to all Papists, and yet here affords them Faith & Repentance to saluation? To this he answereth.

BVRTON.

But withall this silly Papist beleeuing and repenting, must necessarily repent him of all his Idolatry, as well as of all his other sinnes: yes (saith the Author) by a generall repentance and faith: what a strange doctrine is this for a learned Doctor to teach? Surely Bellarmine himselfe, with the whole rabble of Pontificians could doe no more, &c.

Answer.

See here how Sarcastically hee writeth of the most wholsome, and Catholike doctrine of generall Faith and Repentance; and of the Author for teaching it: who if hee be a Doctor of the

Church of England, his fault is the greater: for why should this be Popish doctrine in his mouth, which in *Perkinses* is sound and orthodoxe? Doth not he say plainly in his Treatise of Repentance, *cap.* 1. § *Neither is this to trouble any*; That as God requires particular repentance for knowne sinnes, so he accepts a generall repentance for such as be vnknowne? And doth he not say also in the same place, That sound Repentance for one speciall sinne, brings with it Repentance for all sinnes? And doth hee not say elsewhere, (*Booke of Cases, lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 3. *paragraph. But some may say*) That, *The greater this simple ignorance is, the lesser is the sinne? and that if we be carefull to obey God according to our knowledge, having withall a care and desire to increase in the knowledge of God, and his will, God will have vs excused.* And is not this the selfe-same (*mutatis mutandis*) which this Author or Doctor hath delivered? If the Pope and *Bellarmine*, and the whole rabble of Pontificians would say no worse then so, it would be the best of his worke

worke wee did these seuenty yeares to be reconciled.

BVRTON.

But doth this generall repentance include Idolatry, with all popish trumpery, as things to bee repented of? If not, such repentance shall neuer bring him to saluation.

Answer.

Wee grant all: This Repentance includeth all vnknowne sinnes; and so all Idolatry, and all other popish trumperie.

BVRTON.

If it doe include them, then by faith in Christs merits he comes to be saued, not as a Papist, but as a true beleeuer, renouncing Popery, and then no God-a mercy to his popery, or to his silly ignorance.

Answer.

Loe here is the vpshot of all; this is his strong hold, wherein hee puts his whole trust in this question: And yet (God knowes) it is but a verie starving hole; as poore a shift, and euasion, as euer a man can vse. Here then let it be

obserued, that hee vseth two points of Sophistry, and one of Folly: of Sophistry, first in the word *Papist*; secondly, in the word *renouncing*. The word *Papist* is ambiguous, sometime it is vsed *sensu composito*, (as the Schoolemen speake) or largely: sometimes *sensu diuiso*, or strictly. In the compound sense it signifieth (to inuert the words of *Perkins*) an vnreformed Catholike, that is, one that holds the same necessary heads of Religion with the Protestant Churches; yet so as he retaines all errours in doctrine, whereby the said religion is corrupted in the Church of Rome, ignorantly supposing them to bee the truth of God. In the diuided sense it signifies one that holds the errours of the Church of Rome, without respect to the orthodoxe truth maintained therein. Now to apply this to our purpose; when wee say a papist may bee saued, wee vnderstand it in the former & more large sense. And when he saith, a papist cannot be saued, he vnderstands it in the latter, and more strict sense, and so we are all agreed: for as a theefe,

or a murderer, or any other malefactor cannot be saued, as he is such a one; no more can a Papist as hee holdeth his errours: for no vncleane thing shall enter into the kingdome of heauen: this is the former point of his sophistrie.

The other is in the word *renouncing*: For there are two kindes of renouncing: One actuall and expresse; another virtuall, and infolded. The actuall is when a man doth both in word and practice separate himselfe from the religion of the Church of Rome. The virtuall is, when in preparation of minde, a man is ready to doe it, so soone as it shall appeare to him to be sinfull and damnable: when therefore he requireth that a Papist that must be saued should renounce his popery; if he vnderstand the actuall renouncing thereof, we acknowledge that it is necessary so soone as hee shall know, and be conuicted of the euill of Popery: but if he neuer be conuicted thereof so long as he liueth; then we say the virtuall is sufficient, which is included in generall repentance: otherwise, wee must con-

found sinnes knowne with vnknowne, and generall repentance with particular: This being considered, a man may easily perceiue how a simple ignorant Papist, whether learned or vnlearned, may bee said to renounce his poperie, and to be saued; though he liue and die in the communion of that faith and religion. So much for Sophistry.

Now his folly appeareth in this, that he would haue us to hold, that a Papist (which we say, may be saued by a generall faith and repentance) is saued as a Papist by vertue of his Popish ignorance, idolatry, and other trumpery; and not as a true beleeuer by faith in Christs merits: And that wee would haue some Godamercy to be giuen to Popery, or silly ignorance for his saluation; which ought to be so farre from the conceit of any well disposed Christian, that all of vs must acknowledge, that no Protestant, as a Protestant (communicating with the corruptions of seuerall Churches, Dutch, French, Germane, or the rest; none of which are free from some enormities) the Protestant

ſtant (I ſay) as a Proteſtant, can bee ſaued, without this generall faith and repentance, ſo as there can be no God a-mercy giuen to our Proteſtancy, but onely to faith in Chriſts merits, by which we come to be ſaued, not as Proteſtants, but as true beleeuers, renouncing the corruptions of ſeuerall Churches: And ſo a Proteſtant liuing and dying a Proteſtant, may bee damned; and a Papiſt liuing and dying a Papiſt may be ſaued.

BVRTON.

My concluſion is (to be briefe,) No Papiſt, as a Papiſt whether learned or ignorant can be ſaued; My reaſon is, becauſe Popery denyeth the ſauing faith of Chriſt: and they want the meanes of faith; therefore if they bee ſaued, it muſt be extraordinarily, &c.

Anſwere.

All this which followeth in this Section, is nothing but an idle repetition of thoſe things which haue beene formerly vrged, and anſwered at large: and therefore (with reference thereto) I paſs

it ouer: The same also I say to the next, wherein he takes it for granted, that he speakes the truth; and that his aduersaries do diuorce themselues from sound iudgement, and right reason; and haue no right charity but such as calleth euill good: Because they say, It is an hard sentence, yea malicious, and rash, to say, *That in the Church of Rome there is no saluation*: All which I leaue to the discretion of the Reader. So much for the two questions, and the two former Authors.

BVRTON.

But others would not haue it denyed, that the Church of Rome is a true visible Church, though not a true beleeuing Church.

Answer.

Hauing tid his hands of his two former Authors with a kinde of neglect (as I said afore) hee comes now to his meeke, and sweet spirited Author, a Reuerend Antistes of the Church of England, our diuine *Seneca*, &c. against whom he bends all his forces; and yet like *Iudas* (as you see) betrayeth him

with

with kissing: May not I say to him, as *Horace* to *Lydia* in another case?

——— *Lydia dic per omnes*
Te deos oro, Sybarim cur properas amando
Perdere? ——— So

Burton, *for Gods sake tell me, I thee pray,*
Why thou so lovingly dost Exon *slay?*

I acknowledge my poetry may bee blamed, but the conceit may bee prety and tolerable, (though I say it my selfe) for to say the truth, he laboureth to kill him with kindnesse; in that (as much as in him lyeth) hee blemisheth his well deserued, Reuerend, and Honorable name in the Church with his flattering opposition: But he must be pardoned, for he hath done it to the glory of God and the confusion of Babylon: which if it might proue to be true, I dare bee bold to say, his Author would not only be ready to make an humble and ingenuous palinody, or retractation, (as he sawcily requireth) but euen to sacrifice his goods, good name, soule and body for euer: But I doubt hee hath done

Gods

Gods glory more hurt, and Babylon more good, then any Babylonian Papist hath done these many yeares.

Author.

That which *Laertius* speakes of *Menedemus*, that in disputing his very eyes would sparkle, is true of many of ours; whose zeale transports them to such a detestation of the Romane Church, as if it were all errour, no Church, affecting nothing more then an vtter opposition to their doctrine, and ceremonies, because theirs.

Byfield.

What if we should deny this, that the Church of Rome is a true visible Church? Must we at the first dashe be censured as men transported with zeale out of the detestation of the Church of Rome, as if it were all error, no Church, &c.

Answer.

How are you not ashamed to abuse your Reverend Author, doth he condemne all of them that deny the Church of

of Rome to be a true visible Church in this sort, and manner? are not his expresse words, that it is true of many of them, not of all? Master *Burton*, this dealing becomes not one that contends for the glory of God, and confusion of Babylon: In my conscience, no truly religious wise man will deny, but many of them doe well deserue this censure; and you for one.

BVRTON.

Because theirs? thats not it, but because wholly Antichristian; therefore we detest the whore.

Answer.

Is not that it? M. *Burton*? why then did you before in the depth of your policy, that though it were true that the Church of Rome were a true Church, yet the countenancing or pressing of it in these times might very well be spared? haue you so soone forgotten your selfe? and are the doctrine and ceremonies of that Church wholly Antichristian? when you haue proued it, say so; but till then lay your hand vpon your mouth, and suspend.

BVR-

BVRTON.

And for my part, I had rather some fire-sparkling zeale, yet guided with right iudgment should euen transport mee with a detestation of the Church of Rome, as a false Church; then that I wot not what charity without Zeale, without sound iudgement, should so farre possesse me, as to acknowledge the Church of Rome for a true Church, yea or yet for a true, or truly visible Church.

Answer.

Your zeale (though transporting you) is guided with right iudgement: your Author (though Reuerend) is possessed with a charity without zeale, without sound iudgement; of the two you preferre your owne: it seemes you dwell by bad neighbours, Mr. *Burton*; Else you fall within the compasse of *Catoes Hoc faciunt stulti, &c.*

BVRTON.

And yet, vnder correction, I see no such difference betweene these two, but that if we yeeld the church of Rome

to be a true, or truely visible Church; we may as well call it a true Church.

Answere.

If this will giue you content we will not striue with you: though it may be, wee might puzzle you: And for the next Section it is already answered.

Author.

Neither for the chaffe doe we leaue the floore of God, neyther for the badd fishes doe wee breake his nets.

Burton.

Whether that floore, and those nets, be Antichrists onely, and not Gods, shall appeare more fully anone.

Answer.

Where? can you tell? you promise it, but you never performe it.

Author.

All truth is Gods, where soeuer it is found; not ours: as the Kings coyne is currant, though it bee found in any vncleane chamell.

Burton.

BVRTON.

True: but when the truth of God is turned into a lye, and the Kings coyne beaten into a thinne leafe, &c. the case is altered: And so it is in the Church of Rome.

Answer.

It is vntrue, and contrary to the Apologies of all the Reformed Churches, who stand vpon it, that they haue not made an innouation, or renouation, but onely a reformation, which could not be, if all Gods truth in the Church of Rome were turned into a lye, and that Gods coyne (the Scripture) were vtterly defaced: your selfe haue acknowledged it was not so before the Councell of *Trent*, and I haue proued that it is no worse now (if so ill) as it was before. And if some of those Churches, which yet abide in the vnitie of the Church of Rome, would depart from her, and embrace the truth, they would doe no otherwise, then the Reformed Churches haue done already.

Author.

Fundamentall truth is like the *Me-*

ronaan

ronæan wine, which if it be mixed with twenty times so much water holds its strength.

BVRTON.

The comparison is pretty if it did hold water: but what if into the Maronæan *wine twenty times so much poyson be put? Againe, take the* Maronæan *wine and extract the spirits out of it, what is it then but a dead vappa? such is that truth, which is now in the Church of Romes keeping, &c.*

Answer.

Here his zeale transports him almost to blasphemy, for it is impossible that the fundamentall truth of Gods church should eyther be so poysoned, or the spirits thereof so extracted, as hee affirmeth; if it were otherwise, the gates of hell might preuaile against it: but *Zanchius* saith a great deale better in his Preface before his Booke *De natura Dei*, *Non potuit Satan* (saith hee) *vel in ipsa Romana ecclesia quæcunque voluit efficere, sicut in Orientali fecerat: Invito enim Satana retinuit ecclesia ista præcipua*

fidei

fidei fundamenta quanquam humanis detrimis labefactata: and this he laid since the Councell of Trent: Now let euery wise man iudge, whether *Zanchius* or *Burton* be rather to bee credited: Although I cannot dissemble my dissent also from *Zanchy* himselfe in this point: for hee yeeldeth too much in my conceit, *That Sathan hath effected what hee would in the Orientall Church in abolishing fundamentall truth*: which (vnder correction) I suppose to be vntrue; for that Church euen to this day holdeth the fundamentall truths of Christianitie as well as the Church of Rome: But it may be he speaketh of defection to Mahometry; which is not the Orientall Church.

Author.

The Sepulchre of Christ was ouerwhelmed by the Pagans with earth, and rubbish, &c. yet still there was the Sepulchre of Christ: And it is a ruled case of *Papinian*, that a sacred place loseth not the holinesse with the demolished walls: No more doth the

the Romane Church loſe the claime of a true viſible Church through her manifold and deplorable corruptions.

BVRTON.

How the Church of Rome may bee proued to be a true viſible Church, becauſe once it was ſo, by this compariſon I ſee not; and how a ſound Chriſtian may edifie his faith vpon a compariſon from Papinians *ruled caſe I cannot ſauour: All ſound Diuines know, that places are not further, nor longer ſacred, then the vſe remaineth whereupon at firſt they began to be ſacred.*

Anſwer.

Here is much adoe to ſmall purpoſe; he had little to doe to ſpend his time in confuting ſimilitudes; which were vſed of the Reuerend Author for no other purpoſe then that for which they were originally ordained; which is not to proue, but to illuſtrate: which if hee had ſhewed they doe not, hee had ſaid ſomewhat to the purpoſe; but that he

could not, for they are as apt and fit for the purpose as can be: As for edification of any mans faith vpon these, or other comparisons, I am sure he neuer intended: The very point wee haue in hand is no matter of faith, but of fact: If places remaine sacred so farre, and so long as the vse remaineth whereupon at first they beganne to be sacred, it is all we desire; for so answerably Rome must still be a true visible Church, because the couenant betweene God and her still holdeth, which was the thing which first made her to be a true visible Church: for it followeth.

Author.

If the Church of Rome were once the Spouse of Christ, and her adulteries are knowne; yet the diuorce is not sued out.

BVRTON.

Is not the diuorce sued out? Perhaps not in a legall formality; but what if this once spouse of Christ, not only play the open whore, but professeth her selfe

to be the maried wife of another man? Is this woman ſtill the ſpouſe of her former husband? though ſhee haue not ſued out a legall diuorce? Thus ſtands the caſe with the Church of Rome. But what if Chriſt the firſt husband come and chalenge his ſpouſe againe? ſeeing this ſecond mariage was a nullity? Indeed the Lord is very mercifull. Ier. 3. 1

Anſwer.

Now Mr. *Barton* (as if hee had ſeene the head of *Meduſa*) ſeemes to be depriued of his ſenſes; Is it not? (ſaith he) Perhaps not: But what if this? Is that? But what if that? Indeed then, &c. What ſtaggering is this? It ſeemes this argument hath ſo choaked him, that he cannot ſpeake without coughing: If he could, he ſhould haue done well to haue left the allegory, and to haue proued in plaine termes, that the Couenant betweene Chriſt and the Church of Rome, is vtterly abrogated, and aboliſhed, which I ſuppoſe he will neuer be able to doe.

BVRTON.

But if the diuorce be sued out, then you will say she ceaseth to be a spouse to her former husband; well; and is not that diuorce betweene the Church of Rome and Christ yet sued forth? yes certainly, and that on both parties: First on the Church of Romes part. When? (say you?) In the Councell of Trent (say we.) It is the duty and property of Christs spouse, to hearken to her husbands voice onely, and to honour him. Psal. 45. 11. Luke 9. 35. *But the Church of Rome in the Councell of Trent hath taken out a bill of diuorce, and hath emancipated her selfe wholly to the Pope, as her husband, to heare him in all things from that time forwards: And this diuorce is ratified by the Bull of Pope* Pius 4. super forma iuramenti professionis fidei, *in the end of the Councell.*

Answer.

If I were disposed to picke quarrells, I might haue excepted against many of your absurd phrases since I beganne to deale

deale with you, and againſt one here; of a wiues emancipating her ſelf to another husband: But I ayme at the maine point: I make no doubt then, but the church of Rome hath long agone (euen many hundred years before the Councell of Trent) broken the Couenant of her God; and ſtill abideth in that tranſgreſſion; and ſo deſerueth well enough to be diuorced from Chriſt for euer: But that it was euer her deſire to ſeparate her ſelfe from Chriſt, it will neuer be proued: Nay rather it hath euer bin her cunning to make him a couer and cloake of all her whoredomes and abominations, (as a ſubtile adultreſſe dealeth with her long ſuffering and patient husband) that ſo ſhe may ſeeme to be a Matrone, though ſhe bee indeed a notable Strumpet: and this is the higheſt point of the myſtery of iniquity.

Now how you proue the contrary by the forme of oath of Obedience to the Biſhop of Rome, and of the Profeſſion of the Romane faith, (decreed *Seſſ.* 24. *cap.* 12. of the Councell, to be adminiſtred, and taken, (and accordingly

performed) onely of ſuch Clergy men as are to be preferred to Eccleſiaſticall dignities or benefices with cure of ſoules) doe you your ſelfe (at your farther leiſure) conſider: As if a Schiſmatick ſhould argue by the oathes of Supremacy, Allegiance, and Canonicall Obedience, and by the ſubſcription which are to be performed in the ſame caſe of all that are to be made Miniſters, or admitted to any preferment in the Church of England; that the Church of England alſo hath ſued out a diuorce from Chriſt, and ſo is no true viſible Church: (which God forbid;) As the fanaticall Browniſts and Anabaptiſts ſay vpon the ſelfe ſame reaſon.

BVRTON.

Now if any will require a proofe on Chriſts part, that he hath alſo publickly giuen the Church of Rome a bill of diuorce; let him but ſearch in Gods records: Doth not Chriſt Reuel. 17. *openly declare the Church of Rome to be the Whore of Babylon? and is there not a plaine bill of Diuorce,* Reuel. 18? *and*

and that by a voice from heauen, saying, Come out of her my people, &c? doth not Christ here separate his owne people, his owne spouse out of Babylon? And this diuorce on Christs part, came to bee of force vpon the Councell of Trent; when the Church of Romes second mariage was solemnly concluded, and Christ excluded: what need be said more, to proue this Diuorce, and that on both sides?

Answer.

What need bee said more? (quoth you?) marry much more then either you haue said yet, or euer will bee able to say, I trow: what is it (I pray) you haue said now, that you need to say no more? Is it this? That Rome, and the Romane Church is the whore of Babylon? Wee allow it: Or that Christ would haue his people to separate from her? we grant it: But that the Church of Rome was maried to a second husband in the Councel of Trent, & Christ excluded; or that those words, *Come out of her my people*, are a bill of diuorce; or that Christ by them separateth his

Spouſe from her, we vtterly deny. To the firſt enough hath beene ſaid in the laſt anſwer. To the ſecond wee ſay, firſt that (if *Brightman* your beſt maſter ſay true,) this place muſt not be vnderſtood ſpiritually, but literally, of the locall departure of Gods people out of Rome, and Gods calling them thereto at the laſt ouerthrow and deſtruction thereof, as he called *Lot* out of Sodom, and the Iewes out of the Eaſterne Babylon in the ſame words, & the Church out of Ieruſalem when it was to be vtterly deſtroyed; ſo that as Mice (I vſe his owne ſimilitude) perceiuing the houſe will fall, doe leaue it, and runne away; ſo the people of God warned by the Angell will leaue Rome, and ſhift for themſelues: which being ſo, this Propheſie is not yet fulfilled. Secondly, if it be taken ſpiritually, it is ſo far from prouing a diuorce, that it proueth the quite contrary: for firſt, ſo long as Babylon hath a being, this ſuocation will bee of vſe and force, becauſe ſo long God ſhall haue a people in Babylon; and ſo long there can bee no diuorce, becauſe

becauſe God begets not children of any, but of his Spouſe the Church: Secondly, theſe words declare not what Chriſt himſelfe either doth or will doe, but what hee would haue his people to doe: Now a Diuorce is not a ſeparation of the Familie from the Mother, or Miſtris, but of the huſband from the wife; Ergo, here is no Diuorce intended. To the third, we ſay, that ſeeing the wife is the whore, and the whore is Babylon; Chriſt intendeth not here to ſeparate his Wife or Spouſe from Babylon; becauſe in ſo doing he ſhould ſeparate his wife from his wife, and Babylon from Babylon, which implies a contradiction.

Author.

As it is a viſible Church we haue not detracted to hold communion with it; as Babylon, we can haue nothing to doe with it.

BVRTON.

This diſtinction comes too late, after the ſentence of the diuorce is giuen on both

both sides: Christ hath disclaimed her for his Spouse: bidding his Spouse to come from her: therefore whom God separateth, let no man ioyne together: yea in this case no distinction will serue to ioyne vs together againe in one communion: Herein we must not hearken to the voice of any man bee he neuer so Reuerend, before, or against the voice of Christ: By what distinction (I pray) can an honest and chaste Matrone saue her credit by keeping company, or hauing communion with a notorious Strumpet? Would it not seem a strange distinction to say, The Deuill in his essence being good, wee detract not to hold communion with him; but as a Deuill, wee can haue nothing to doe with him?

Answer.

You abuse your selfe and the Reader too bad, and that in two things: First, in blaming the distinction: Secondly, in scandalizing your Author. The distinction (you say) comes too late, and is not vseful to ioyne vs together again

in

in one communion. The former whereof is falſe, as hath beene ſhewed in the former anſwers. The latter dependeth vpon the ſcandals of the Author; for the better vnderſtanding whereof wee are to know, That the reformed Churches neuer made a full, and totall ſeparation from the Church of Rome; but onely partiall, from her corruptions; *Non tum ab ea, quam ab eius erroribus diſceſſimus*, ſaith *Iewel* in his Apologie, which is the common voice of all, euen of *Perkins* himſelfe in his *Reformed Catholike*, who ſhewes in euery head of doctrine, how farre wee may and muſt hold communion with that Church: and to this and no more hath the Reuerend Author reſpect in this aſſertion: Now this Calumniator would make the world beleeue, that his intent is to vſe a meanes by help of this diſtinction to ioyne vs together againe in one communion in thoſe things wherein we are already ſeparated: which as it was far from his heart and meaning (for his whole Treatiſe tends to the contrary) ſo indeed it were a vaine thing for him

to

to endeuour it by this distinction. For it would be all one as if hee should say, *As she is a visible Church, wee may communicate with her in her corruptions; But as she is Babylon we may not.* Which is indeede the folly which hee illustrateth by his two similitudes of societie with a strumpet and the deuill. Thus you see the honesty, and wisedome of the man; and by this you may iudge of his zeale for the glory of God.

Author.

They haue not well heeded the charitable profession of zealous *Luther, Nos fatemur, &c. We professe* (saith hee) *that vnder the Papacie, there is much Christian good, yea all, &c. I say moreouer that vnder the Papacie is true Christianitie, yea, the very kernell of Christianity, &c.*

Byrton.

Luthers *speech then was true: But euer* distingue tempora; Luther *wrote that before the Councell of Trent, till which the Church of Rome had not altered the rule of Faith: But now wee*

that

that line after that Councell cannot say so: for in that Councell the nut was crackt, the kernell reiected, yea anathematized, and now they haue retained no more, but the broken shell of a Church.

Answer.

It is a strange thing to see how men are enamoured of their owne conceits, *Qui amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt* (saith the Poet) I warrant you if M. *Burton* were braied in a morter, yet would not these toyes depart from him. *Huartus* in his Tryall of wits, reporteth of a Noble-mans Page in *Spaine*, that (being distracted of his wits) imagined himselfe to be a King, in which conceit he so pleased himselfe, that when hee was cured, hee was displeased with the Physitian that restored him to his right minde: and so I doubt M. *Burton* will be with those that shew him the vanities of these his imaginations. Well, howsoeuer it be, wee must be content, and suffer him to abound in his owne sense, till Time the Mother of Truth reueale his grosse mistakings: and in the

the meane while let it bee sufficient answer to this long discourse, that here is nothing but idle repetition of those things which haue beene already answered. And hitherto we haue answered what hee hath obiected to what was said in the Booke of *The old Religion* concerning this argument.

Author.

Nothing can be so well said, or done, but may be ill taken.

BVRTON.

Now God forbid: But is it well said, or done, to affirme that the Church of Rome is yet a true, or a true visible Church? Now let the Reuerend Author iudge indifferently (hauing well weighed the former reasons) whether we doe ill or no in taking his saying ill, or whether wee had not reason to haue expected an ingennous Palinodie or Augustine-like Retractation, rather then such an Apologie: which whether it be rather to be pitied, then any vncharitablenesse in the Reader in taking such a saying ill, let indifferent charitie it selfe iudge: Nor need we stretch the saying

saying to imply, that the Church of Rome is a true beleeuing Church: Suffice it we except against any being, yea or visibility of a true Church in the Synagogue of Rome.

Answer.

Some men are like Nettles, which if a man handle softly, they sting him; but if hardly and roughly, they are not felt. Our Reuerend Antistes hauing but glanced at the zeale of some, transported to such a detestation of the Romane church, as if it were all error, no church; is deeply censured, as if preferment had changed his note, and taught him to speake more plausible language of the Church of Rome, then eyther hee did, or ought. Hereupon he frames an Apologeticall, milde, and Christian Aduertisement, to rectifie their iudgement, lest their preiudice may turne more to their sinne, then to his wrong: Whats the issue? Nothing but scorne: forsooth they expected that the Reuerend Author, (well weighing the former reasons,) would haue made a pittifull Retractation

tractation, and not such an *Augustine*-like Apologie. Nay, they will not acknowledge any the least mistaking in the matter; yea, those words (*Nothing can be so well said or done, but may be ill taken*, which are the ordinary preamble to reconciliation) are taken amisse: and so proue themselues to be true through their frowardnesse. What then is to be done? *Hæc non succedit, alia ineunda est via:* The Reuerend Author must vse them like hounds; which the more a man beateth, the better they loue him: or like the wilde Irish; which are most seruiceable when they are most slauishly vsed. And so they shall haue their desire; a *Palinodie*, or *Retractation*; which is, *That it repenteth him, that hee hath dealt so fauourably with them.* For as for their reasons, (if they were not as bold and blinde as Bayard himselfe) they would be ashamed to commend them to the iudgement of iudicious Charity.

Author.

Who sees not that [*visible*] referres to outward profession, [*true*] to some

some essential principles of Christianitie? neyther of them to soundnesse of beleefe?

BVRTON.

Is outward profession a sufficient marke of visibilitie for a Church? This is none of those markes which the Church of England takes notice of a Church by.

Answer.

No? Are not they the preaching of the word, administration of sacraments and Ecclesiasticall discipline? And what outward profession of Christianitie, can any visible church make without these? Outward profession therefore, comprehendeth them all; and so is a sufficient marke of visibilitie for a Church.

BVRTON.

Againe, the Scripture calls them the Synagogue of Satan, which call themselves Iewes and are not.

Answer.

True; yet were they true Iewes in the flesh, and outwardly, now 2. 28. 29.

and so may a true visible Church of Christians be also.

BVRTON.

The Samaritanes sometimes professed themselues to bee of the Iewes religion, and professed the worship of the Lord, were they therefore a visible Church?

Answer.

The reason is not like; because they neuer were in the Couenant of Gods grace, but were aliens from the Common wealth of Israel.

BVRTON.

And for the essentiall principles of Christianity, the Iewes at this day hold the Old Testament; and if it bee said, They deny Christ expressely, the Papists doe so too implicitely; and by their owne expresse doctrines of Trent, haue no more communion with Christ then the Iewes haue: Nay Papists doe expresly abiure the doctrine of Christ, as wee shewed before in the Popes owne Bull.

Answer.

The tongue that lyeth, slayeth the soule;

soule: Such comparisons are not onely odious, but damnable. If this zeale do not transport you to sinne, I doubt not but euill-speakers, raylers, and slanderers may finde an easie passage into the kingdome of heauen.

Author.

Grant the Romanists to be but Christians, how corrupt soeuer; and wee cannot deny them the name of a Church.

BVRTON.

But why should we grant them that which neuer a Papist is able to demonstrate to vs; or yet vndoubtedly to perswade himselfe of?

Answer.

This fond conceit is sufficiently answered already.

BVRTON.

Although for the bare name of Christians and of a Church, wee will not much stand with them; so they do not hereupon, or any for them, incroach and challenge the being and realitie, yea or the very visibility of a true Church.

Answer.

You are very liberall of that which is none of your owne: Can you bee content to afford the precious name of a Christian and of a Church of Christ to them which in mans iudgement not partially affected, are not so? The Iews would neuer doe it; neither will the Papists doe it; neither will the Reformed Churches doe it; neither will any well informed Christian doe it: But you will not much stand vpon it.

Author.

We are all the same Church, by vertue of our outward vocation, whosoeuer all the world ouer worship Iesus Christ the onely Sonne of God, the Sauiour of the world, and professe the same common Creed.

BVRTON.

Doth the Church of Rome worship Iesus Christ, who for Christ worship the Beast and his Image, bearing his mark?

Answer.

Answer.

Doe all in the Church of Rome doe so? what they whose names are written in the Lambs booke of life? *Rev.* 13.8. or are you sure that none of the Church of Rome living and dying professed members thereof are written therein?

BVRTON.

Doe they hold the same Creed, that deny the faith, without which they cannot say the first words of the Creed, I beleeue in God?

Answer.

And dare you say that all and euery one in the Church of Rome doth so?

Author.

Rome doth both hold the foundation, and destroy it; she holds it directly, destroyes it by consequent.

BVRTON.

What foundation doe they hold directly with vs? wee shewed before, that they haue nothing of Christ, but the shell, the shadow, the Pope is the kernell, if any.

Answer.

You said so indeed, but you shewed it not: yet if they haue the shell, that is the outward profession of the foundation directly, it is enough to make them be said to hold the foundation directly.

BVRTON.

Nay doe they hold more of Christ directly, then the very society of Deuils doe? yea or so much as they?

Answer.

They doe, if your selfe say true: for you say, that *To hold the foundation directly, is to hold Iesus Christ so to be come in the flesh, as therein to suffer and satisfie for our salvation, becoming our Christ, our Iesus, redeeming vs from our sinnes by imputing his merits to vs, that our sins might not be imputed to vs which were imputed to him, by whose stripes wee are healed, by whose righteousnesse imputed wee are perfectly justified in the sight of God.* And all, and euery point of this, the Church of Rome directly holdeth.

BVRTON.

Nothing lesse: yea she directly, not by consequence onely; directly (I say) shee denieth and destroyeth this foundation: How? and where? In the Councell of Trent, Sess. 6. Can. 10. Siquis dixerit homines per ipsam Christi iustitiam formaliter iustos esse, Anathema sit: *Is not this a direct, and flat expresse denyall of the foundation?*

Answer.

Is this an expresse, flat, and direct denial of the foundation? then *Melanchthon, Calvin, Illyricus*, and all sound and good Protestants doe expressly, flatly, and directly deny the Foundation: for all of them doe, and must hold this doctrine for accursed: and all the Ministers of the Church of England haue cause to be ashamed of your ignorance & boldnesse (Mr. *Burton*) who dare challenge the Church of Rome to denie the foundation directly in that wherein she holdeth and confirmeth the truth of the Gospel: you must know therefore that in these words is condemned the damnable

nable doctrine of *Andrew Osiander*, and his followers; who taught and held, that a man is formally iustified by the very Righteousnesse by which Christ himselfe is essentially iust and righteous, being partakers thereof by inhabitation: This allegation therefore is a notable abuse not only of the Counсel, but of your selfe and the Reader. See *Bellarmine de Iustif. lib. 2. cap. 2. Sect. 2. His verbis*: though himselfe offend therein also afterwards.

BVRTON

And in the 11th Canon; If any shall say, that men are iustified by the sole imputation of Christs righteousnes, or by sole remission of sins, (otherwise then by* inherent righteousnesse by vs obtained thereby) or also that the grace of God whereby wee are iustified, is onely the favour of God, let him bee accursed: *What more direct denial of the foundation?*

* See the 7. chap. of the same Sess.

Answer,

Answer.

I might here challenge you for altering, and changing the words of the Councell; but I will not take all advantages: I answer therefore, that it seems you know not the true meaning of the Councell; for taking the word *Iustification* in the Councels owne sense, this Canon contains very sound and Christian doctrine. What then doth it mean by Iustification? A compound of Protestant Iustification, and Sanctification: for so it defines Iustification, *cap.* 7. of this Session in the first words: *Iustificatio est, non sola peccatorum remissio, sed & sanctificatio, & renouatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ & donorum*: and so the true sense and meaning of the Canon is this: *If any man shall say, that men are so iustified by the sole imputation of Christs righteousnesse, or by sole remission of sinnes, that they are also sanctified thereby without inherent grace and charity, or also that the grace whereby wee are so iustified is onely the favour of God; let him bee accursed*: and let him be so indeed for me. You will

will say this is nothing but meere iugling: I grant it; but it is not direct denyall of the foundation: for here (as *Chemnitius* acknowledgeth) is both remission of sinnes, and imputation of Christs righteousnesse included; which though it be sufficient to iustification in the Protestant sense, yet in the popish sense (wherein sanctification is also required) it is not sufficient.

BVRTON.

Is not this the foundation, That Iesus Christ came into the world to saue sinners? *and how? who his owne selfe bare our sinnes in his owne bodie on the tree; that we being dead to sins, should liue vnto righteousnesse; by whose stripes we are healed: Nay (saith the Councell of Trent directly) wee are iustified by our inherent righteousnes, and so our stripes are healed, and not by the righteousnesse of Christ simply imputed: Therefore come out of her my people.*

Answere.

How the Councell is to be vnderstood,

ſtood, I haue ſhewed already: and being ſo vnderſtood, there is no direct denyall of the foundation: Therefore although Gods people muſt come out of Babylon; yet not vpon this ground: And ſo I conclude as I beganne, *Apply* Iohn Barber, *and thou ſhalt haue a new payre of ſizars.* For marke the argument: *The foundation is, Ieſus Chriſt came to ſaue ſinners, &c. But the Councel of Trent ſaith, We are ſo iuſtified that wee are alſo ſanctified by inherent righteouſneſſe:* Ergo, *Come out of her my people.*

Author.

Thus I wrote well neare twenty yeares agone without clamour, without cenſure: If any of you be otherwiſe minded; I dare boldly ſay, hee ſhall doe more wrong to his cauſe, then to his aduerſary. I differ not from the iudgement of our beſt, Orthodoxe, and approuedly Claſſicall Diuines.

BVRTON.

Let not antiquity in the holding of an opinion, preſcribe againſt truth Opi-

niens

nions Ancient. O that S. Ambrose his words alledged by our Reuerend Author might here take place; Nullus pudor est ad meliora transire: then I hope he will be otherwise minded then to say, He that denyeth the Church of Rome to be a true Church, or a true visible Church, shall doe more wrong to his cause then to his aduersarie; Then he will no longer stand vpon the iudgement of particular persons in a point wherein our Reuerend Mother Church of England hath in her publique doctrine resolued the contrary: So shall our diuine Seneca partake also of great Saint Augustines praise, while by an humble and ingenuous Retractation, he shall both purge away the staine, and put a more glorious lustre to his most sweet, pious, and for their kinde vnparalleld workes; And for me a poore vnworthy Minister, I hope his meeke and sweet spirit (hauing well weighed my reasons, and pitied my weaknesses) will be pleased to excuse me of any transportation of zeale, vnlesse herein I haue exceeded the bounds, in presuming so

farre

farre vpon the patience of such a Reuerend Antistes of our Church: But, I trust he will not impute this to any arrogancy of spirit, when it shall appeare, it is to vindicate Christs truth and glorie, against the Synagogue of the proud Antichrist.

Answer.

It is well obserued, that this fellow hath a notable dexterity in dedicating Epistles before his Bookes, and in Prefaces, Digressions, Epilogues, and the like; but that in his Tracts, Discobrises, and Disputations, he is as hungry and dry as Famine it selfe: This as it is true in all his writings, so especially in this; as I hope I haue in good measure made it appeare by the premisses. And for this his conclusion; All the glozing thereof tends to obtaine two requests: One that the Reuerend Author would be brought to humble himselfe vnto him in an ingenuous Retractation; And the other, that he would hold him excused for his presumption: Both are vnreasonable: vnlesse hee will take that for a Retractation which before hath beene

tendred;

tendred; and for an excuse, that he supposeth it ignorant arroganc, rather then zeale that hath transported him: He would strike an impression into the innocent soule of the Reuerend Author, that he hath contracted some staine by this assertion, *That the Church of Rome is a true, or truly visible Church*: And indeed it is too well knowne that such companions as he is haue for a long time taken vpon them to bee the Censors of all mens doings, and to cry vp and downe euery mans credit and reputation at their pleasure: But (God bee praised) he is ἐξωβολῶν, out of their gunshot: for it is well knowne to God and man, that all his courses from the cradle haue beene such, that Fame her selfe may lay her hand vpon her mouth, so as he need not endeauor to purge away any staine, which they shall impute vnto him. The close of his Aduertisement, will so possesse the soules of all good and honest men, that the strife of tongues shall neuer bee able to molest him.

Thus

Thus (saith he) *in a desire to stand but so right as I am, in all honest iudgments, I haue made this speedy and true Apology; beseeching all Readers in the feare of God (before whose barre we shall once giue an account of all our euerlastings) to iudge wisely, and vprightly of what I haue written: In a word, to do me but iustice in their opinions; and when I beg it, fauour.*

FINIS.

EN